

# THE MONTH

MAR.-APRIL, 1946

Vol. CLXXXII EIGHTY-SECOND YEAR

No. 950

## CONTENTS

	Page
COMMENTS .....	By the Editor 81
YUGOSLAVIA. WEST OR EAST?.....	By C. E. Polson 97
ATHENS: OCTOBER, 1944 .....	By Christopher Deulin 108
WHAT SHALL I BRING YOU ( <i>Verse</i> ).....	By A. C. Jenkins 115
THE PRIESTS OF DACHAU .....	By L. de Coninck 116
BLOTTING-PAPER THERAPY .....	By George Byrne 125
THE CONSECRATION OF MATTHEW PARKER ....	By Leo Hicks 131
MISCELLANEA .....	144
I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES.	
Some Recent Works on Scholastic Philosophy.	
II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES.	
REVIEWS .....	148
1.—Inside Rome with the Germans. By Jane Scrivener. 2.—(1) Science Past and Present. By F. Sherwood Taylor, M.A., Ph.D. (2) The Fourfold Vision; A Study of the Relations of Science and Religion. By the same author. 3.—Civisme du Chrétien de France. By Michel Riquet, S.J. 4.—The First Epistle of St. Peter. The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Essays. By Edward Gordon Selwyn, D.D., Dean of Winchester. 5.—(1) John Henry Newman. By John Moody. (2) John Henry Newman: Centenary Essays. 6.—The Knox New Testament.	
SHORT NOTICES .....	156

PUBLISHED BY LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.

43 Albert Drive, London, S.W.19

EDITORIAL OFFICES:

114 Mount Street, London, W.1

MANAGER'S ADDRESS:

Manresa Press, Roehampton, S.W.15, to which Annual Subscriptions,  
13s. post free (U.S.A. \$3.25), should be sent.

TWO SHILLINGS NET

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

THE WESTMINSTER VERSION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.  
*A New Translation from the Original Greek and Hebrew Texts.* General Editors :  
the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., Professor of Fundamental Theology at  
Heythrop College, Oxon, and the Rev. John Murray, S.J., Editor of *The Month*.

## THE NEW TESTAMENT IN FOUR VOLUMES

**VOLUME I**—THE GOSPELS OF MATTHEW, MARK AND LUKE, by the Rt. Rev.  
Mgr. Dean, D.D., Ph.D.

(CHRONOLOGY AND HARMONY OF THE LIFE OF CHRIST, by the Rev.  
Cuthbert Lattey, S.J.) 8vo. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

**VOLUME II**—THE GOSPEL OF JOHN, by the Rev. W. S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D. THE  
ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, by the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J. 8vo. Cloth,  
10s. 6d. net.

**VOLUME III**—THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS (1st and 2nd), GALATIANS,  
ROMANS, EPHESIANS, COLOSSIANS, PHILEMON and PHILIPPIANS, by  
the Most Rev. Alban Goodier, and Fathers Lattey, Keating, Keogh and Rickaby, S.J.  
8vo. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

**VOLUME IV**—THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, THE PASTORAL AND JOHAN-  
NINE EPISTLES, THE APOCALYPSE, THE EPISTLES OF JAMES, PETER  
AND JUDE, by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Boylan, D.Litt., D.D., Francis Gigot, S.T.D.,  
and W. H. Kent, O.S.C. 8vo. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

---

LONGMANS, GREEN & Co., LTD., 43 Albert Drive, London, S.W.19

The following parts of the OLD TESTAMENT have been published in the large  
edition by LONGMANS, GREEN & Co. Ltd. They are sold in paper covers only.

Price - 2/- net (Nos. 1 to 4)

- (1) THE BOOK OF JONA, by the Rev. T. E. Bird, D.D., Ph.D.
- (2) NAHUM and HABAKKUK, by the late Dom Hugh Bévenot, O.S.B., B.A.
- (3) THE BOOK OF MALACHY, by the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J.
- (4) THE BOOK OF RUTH, by the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J.
- (5) THE FIRST BOOK OF PSALMS (Psalms i to xli) : Large Edition, by  
the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J. Paper covers only. Price, 4s. net.

---

THE PSALTER IN THE WESTMINSTER VERSION. Small Edition, con-  
taining all the Psalms, by the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J. Cloth Boards only.  
Price, 10s. 6d. net. (Sands & Co.)

---

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.,  
43 ALBERT DRIVE, LONDON, S.W.19

# THE MONTH

VOL. CLXXXII MARCH-APRIL, 1946

No. 950

## EDITORIAL COMMENTS

### Their Eminences of 1946

**T**HE Roman ceremonies are all over, and the newly-created cardinals are back, most of them, in their own countries. The 1946 consistories were a splendid manifestation of the inter-national or, better, the supra-national character of the Catholic Church. Men of eminence have met and remained together in Rome, united in faith and apostolic spirit, with a common devotion to Christ, their Divine Master, and to the Holy Father, Christ's earthly vicar, and in joint witness to those Christian ideals and principles of truth and justice and universal charity, on which alone can health and order be restored to a war-scarred world. They met, not only as individuals, but also as representing millions of their countrymen, different in speech and national culture and traditions, to say nothing of differences of class and political outlook. But all these millions are held together in one Catholic faith, in the one common understanding of life's final purpose, and in membership of the One Church of Christ. To our own Cardinal of Westminster—this is our first opportunity of doing so in writing—we offer heartfelt congratulations and the earnest wish that he may enjoy many and fruitful years in the continued service of his Divine Master. And with this wish we couple similar wishes for the two other "Empire" or "Commonwealth" cardinals, Cardinal Gilroy of Sydney and Cardinal McGuigan of Toronto. The appointment of an Australian cardinal and of a second cardinal for Canada, where Cardinal Villeneuve is already Archbishop of Quebec, is a tribute to the growing importance of the Catholic Church in the British Commonwealth as also to the Holy Father's appreciation of the ideas and practical policies of the Commonwealth, which he has publicly voiced on more than one occasion. Nor should we forget two darker strands in this tapestry of joyfulness and ceremony: the death of Cardinal Glennon, not in St. Louis, the city of his many years of pastoral responsibility, but, on his way back from Rome, in the island of his birth and priestly education; the death, too, of the Cardinal of Münster. Reports agree that Cardinal von Galen was the outstanding figure during the consistories, in part because of his commanding presence and personality, but chiefly on account of his fearless condemnation of Nazi teaching and his intrepid defence of the victims of Nazi ill-treatment and oppression. With Cardinal von Preysing, his colleague in the German episcopate and in common resistance to Nazi pressure, he represented the best hopes of millions of his fellow Germans that their country might rise out of dishonour and disaster through a new recognition of Christian and Catholic truth. A novel

note was sounded by the nomination of the first Chinese cardinal, eloquent of the "Catholic" quality of the Church, with its mission to men of every race and class. The "progressive" policy of Pius XI and Pius XII, in promoting a "native" clergy and hierarchy in China, India and Japan, particularly, receives its fitting crown in the appointment of a Chinese cardinal. One last feature calls for special comment: and this, the creation of six new cardinals for Latin America.

### The Significance of Latin America

THE appointment of these cardinals indicates that the Holy Father recognizes the great advance in status which the Latin countries of America have made in recent years. Their development has been rapid during the past quarter of a century; it is likely to be even more speedy in the next twenty-five years. If it be true that the centre of gravity of the Anglo-Saxon world has shifted from Britain to the U.S.A., it is equally true that the centre of gravity of the Latin peoples is shifting from the Mediterranean towards South America. Twenty Latin American States are numbered among the United Nations; they are the most united, if not the most powerful, group in U.N.O. There are doubtless differences in the policies of nineteen of them towards the Argentine, but at San Francisco they joined together to demand the admittance to U.N.O. of that twentieth Latin American State. There are differences also in their individual attitude to Spain, and some of them, those most affected by Left-wing movements, have protested against the present Spanish Government. But South American culture and traditions are far more Spanish (or Portuguese, in the case of Brazil) than those of the United States are English. As far as the white population is concerned, there is more community of origin, a longer historical association, and there is not the same latent anti-European feeling. Further, a definite religious tie exists between Spain and Portugal and the Latin New World, such as scarcely exists between Britain and the U.S.A. Call Britain and the U.S.A. Protestant, if you please; negatively, they have much in common; but positively, North American Protestantism is largely Baptist and Methodist, with some Presbyterianism and Lutheranism. The American Episcopal Church, which has the closest affinities with the Established Church of England, is a relatively small body. Between the Latin countries to either side of the Atlantic exists a common bond of Catholic belief and culture, which is likely to have very great influence on the development of these American States and upon their relations with the Latin peoples of Europe. In a not too recent American magazine, I discovered lately an article by Richard Pattee, a recognized authority on South American affairs. Emphasizing the "reality of Catholicism" in Latin America, he wrote as follows:

This excessively Catholic atmosphere is a very important clue to the problems of the Church in Hispanic America. It is not with reference



to the somewhat infantile idea sometimes advanced that the Church has lost its influence because it has had no competition. Religion, after all, is not a matter of supply and demand, nor does it fit into the framework of the ordinary commercial transaction. There is no ground for thinking that if Methodism, Mormonism or Holy Rollerism had taken root in Latin America, the Catholic Church would to-day be a more vigorous and flourishing institution. The exclusively Catholic environment has meant that the Catholic way of life has maintained itself even if Catholic practice has often been deficient.

Even those who never enter a church nor pretend to comply with the most indispensable of practices, cannot escape the reality of Catholicism which is evident on every hand. The only religious edifice which strikes the eye in every Latin American community is the Catholic Church. The only religious figures whom one sees on the streets are Catholic priests or nuns. The only external evidences of birth, marriage and death are Catholic. The visible evidences of the Faith are everywhere in the form of images, statues, tiny figures in corner niches, and the like. The less worldly-wise Latin American is an individual to whom no other religion exists outside of the Church. The rumours that may reach him of other rites and other forms are vague and unimportant. Catholicism is part and parcel of his environment, tradition and experience. He may revile the local priest, make mockery of the novenas which his womenfolk attend, and refuse obstinately to frequent the Sacraments. But this same individual is part of the Catholic background into which he was born. He very probably will demand a priest when the final moment of his earthly life comes upon him.

The British consistently underestimate the influence of religion and religious culture upon practical events. Particularly do they undervalue, as they misunderstand, this reality of Catholicism.

### Spanish Relations

THE Anglo-Saxon peoples will need closer co-operation with this Latin world of overseas which, in its turn, will certainly establish more intimate associations with the Latin European countries, notably Portugal and Spain. In view of this, the present attitude of France towards Spain—an attitude not sufficiently discouraged by the United States and Britain—is as unwise as it may prove disastrous. The French are living in a glasshouse, from which it is highly imprudent to be throwing stones, in any direction whatsoever. They have no constitution; their interim government is an uneasy team of three parties, the most extreme of which is thinking more of how the constitution, now being framed, can be eventually overthrown and followed by a Communist dictatorship than how it can reasonably be implemented. If one of these two countries has the right to complain of bad neighbourly conduct on its frontiers, it is Spain, not France; for there have been many local raids upon Spanish territory by armed groups of Spanish Communists, resident in the South of France. No doubt, a truculent policy towards General Franco is the price that moderate Frenchmen have to pay to secure some kind of temporary collaboration with the well-organized and well-subsidized Communist

party. But, General Franco quite apart, it is a dangerous policy for the future relations of France and Spain. The Spaniards do not like the French, and it must be granted they have no strong reasons for liking them; they mistrust Communist and Russian influence in France, after their bitter memories of Communist and Russian interference in their own country; above all, they are determined to avoid civil war, and French policy, in their opinion, aims at provoking it. Whatever the demerits of the Franco régime—these I am not discussing—the plain fact is that this anti-Franco campaign abroad has strengthened General Franco's hand in Spain and enhanced his prestige. Papers, as little Francoist in their sympathies as the *Times*, have admitted in recent reports that the "Republican" group round Señor Giral is quite discredited; the Spanish people know that these émigrés have lived in comfortable exile on Spanish gold, and they prefer that this exile should be continued indefinitely. No change of régime could occur in Spain except through the restoration of monarchy or an Army coup d'état; the former is impossible except with the consent of General Franco, and Don Juan's cards have been played very clumsily by his advisers; the latter, to say the least, is extremely improbable. Besides, neither of these solutions would be soothing for French extremists. If one inquires what are the ultimate purposes behind this Russian-inspired campaign against Franco, they are not difficult to discover. There is a long-term hope that, through intervention from abroad, maybe by the French, civil war would commence in Spain, and in the resulting chaos Russia might succeed in achieving what she failed to achieve from 1936 to 1939, political control of the Iberian Peninsula, and consequently control, from the West end, of the Mediterranean, which is one of the long-term objectives of her foreign policy. A fantastic conception, perhaps; but, with a France Communist or very "Left," and the military power of Russia dominant on the Continent, it is no more fantastic a conception than was that of a Spain, overrun by the Nazi armies from 1940 to 1942. There is a shorter-term hope that should be kept in mind, namely Russia's desire to prevent any near association of Western European States and any formation of a Western bloc. While relations between France and Spain continue embittered, this objective is temporarily secured. It would be to the gravest disadvantage of Britain and the U.S.A. to have strife and disorder in Western Europe, still more so if this were to result in an increase in Soviet influence and interference.

### Politics and Food Relief

THAT way lies much danger. On the other hand, in the present state of acute political feeling, it would not be easy to introduce Spain into the assembly of the United Nations, from which at Potsdam it was deliberately and by name excluded. This does not, however, exclude attempts to improve relations between the other Powers and Spain. Such an improvement is scarcely likely to arise out of the

International Food Conference, held in London during the early days of April. To this conference, invitations were extended, presumably by the British authorities, to member States, like Belgium, Holland, France, Denmark, Greece, Luxembourg, Norway, Turkey and the U.S.A. ; to non-members, Russia, Byelo-Russia and the Ukraine, with Russian-controlled Poland and Yugoslavia, plus Czechoslovakia, though, of this group only Poland attended, the rest ignoring invitations ; to ex-enemy countries, Finland, Hungary, Italy, Roumania, Austria, and the Allied Control Councils for Germany and Bulgaria ; and, finally, to four neutral Powers, Sweden, Switzerland, Portugal and Eire. The press announcement stated : " Spain, Albania and Iceland have not been invited because it is felt that they have little to gain or to contribute to the conference." The Spaniards are a proud and generous people ; they will not appreciate the bracketing of their country with Albania and Iceland, nor will they consider it self-evident that Spain can make no contribution to the vast problem of European food relief. The dishonesty of this exclusion is made apparent from the press report which continued : " It will be the aim of the conference *to avoid politics completely* and to approach their problems from *the strictly humanitarian point of view*." Are we to conclude that Spain was excluded, not for reasons of *politics* (these are to be " avoided completely ") but because the Spanish people are so constituted as to be unable to work for humanitarian ideals ? This interference of politics with relief work is raising very serious problems indeed for U.N.R.R.A. Its Council meeting in Atlantic City was gravely disturbed by the evidence that U.N.R.R.A. supplies, which have been made available regardless of local politics, have been diverted to serve political ends. The Russian Government, for instance, has recently promised to send to France 500,000 tons of wheat, at the request of M. Thorez—it is stated, out of her stocks of U.N.R.R.A. wheat. She has also re-exported wheat to provision the armies of " Tito " in Yugoslavia, which should have been demobilised months ago and sent to work on the land. Reports from Poland agree that a variable percentage of U.N.R.R.A. goods destined for the Poles is confiscated by the Russians for their own use, and the remainder is not equitably distributed. If political considerations are to be banished from humanitarian work, it is not the Spaniards who need remonstrances, but Russia and her satellite governments in East-Central Europe. The Spanish people find it hard to understand or to respect what they term our " selective democracy." They cannot comprehend, for example, how United States representatives can sit comfortably at a conference table with representatives from " Tito " Yugoslavia, which they do not recognize because it has fulfilled none of the conditions they deem essential for proper diplomatic recognition, yet appear unwilling to do the same with the representatives of the Government of Spain, with which they have been and, technically, are still in diplomatic relationship.

### Now or Never

THE New York Meeting of the Security Council should have encouraged those who believe in U.N.O. and are anxious that it shall, this time, be made to work. The firm stand taken against M. Gromyko's request for a postponement of the Persian question and the continuance of the study of this question, even after his withdrawal from the Council's meeting, were indications of a seriousness of intention that were very welcome. Only in this spirit can U.N.O. establish itself; only thus can a world organization be made to function and to employ moral pressure and, if needs be, material force to maintain peace. Appeasement would have been fatal: we have had enough of that and to spare. Appeasement at Munich, where there was more excuse for it, made the war of 1939 practically inevitable. Appeasement at Yalta and Potsdam have brought us the present series of international crises and the general air of suspicion and mistrust. A firm stand is not necessarily an unfriendly stand. Britain's prestige was enhanced during the January U.N.O. meetings in London by Mr. Bevin's readiness to discuss and rebut the Soviet charges against British policy in Greece and Indonesia. Anglo-Russian relations did not deteriorate because of that frankness. Nor need the relations between Russia and the other Powers suffer, if Russia honestly faces and answers the Persian complaints. They are far more likely to suffer from the suspicion that Russia was unable to give an honest reply to these complaints and that, in suggesting a postponement of the Persian affair, she required more time to secure concessions from the Persian authorities under duress. According to Dr. Hussein Ala, the Persian delegate, Russia demanded an autonomous régime in Azerbaijan, under a Governor-General—this is the province where a few hundred tribesmen have been groomed as twentieth century "democrats" in the Tudeh party,—the setting-up of a Russo-Polish oil company, with 51 per cent. of the shares in Russian hands, and permission for some Russian troops to stay indefinitely on Persian soil. Yet, all Russian forces ought to have been withdrawn by March 2nd, and this not only in treaty arrangements with Persia, but also with Britain. The Persian issue was extremely grave. If the United Nations Organization can safeguard Persian integrity and independence—both are threatened—and compel or persuade the Russian Government to retreat, then it will have won its first serious encounter. If not, and still more if it lose confidence and accept some shoddy compromise, then, it may suffer a defeat from which no recovery is possible. Compromise here will mean a Turkish issue and perhaps an Afghan issue in the near future; there are already indications of Soviet activity among the Kurdish tribes in Turkey and Iraq. Yet, on the other side, the Russian delegates, both in London and New York, have been given a lesson in international democracy. If they learn that lesson or at least learn to accommodate themselves



to that procedure, much improvement may take place. It is obvious that U.N.O. wants the co-operation of the Russian Government, and it is just as obvious that it will not be easy to have it on the only terms which the democratic countries can understand and tolerate. Marshal Stalin, shortly before the New York meeting, declared that the strength of U.N.O. consisted in the fact that it was based on the principle of equality between States and not on the principle of the domination of some States by others. If, in their international dealings, the Russian Government can learn to act in accordance with these professions rather than with its practice during the past few years, it may begin to play that part in the new world organization which the remaining member-States would be glad to see it play, though up to the present they have had little encouragement for thinking it will play it. The results of later Security Council meetings were more encouraging. The Council's firmer attitude did bring about a change of Russian policy. The Russians declared that their troop withdrawal was "unconditional"; previously, they had made it dependent upon the absence of "unforeseen circumstances." They admitted that the future of Azerbaijan was a domestic affair of the Persian people, and, though there have been Russo-Persian discussions on the formation of a joint oil company, these are not to be concluded until they can be discussed and ratified by the Persian Parliament. This change of policy, on the part of the Russian Government, is certainly a victory for U.N.O. A crisis, and a very serious one, has been tided over—perhaps only for a time, maybe more permanently: and this has been achieved, not by compromise, but through a firm and fair attitude, with due respect for the rights of a smaller country.

### **The Labour Party and the Communist Party in Britain**

ON March 27th, the National Executive of the Labour Party gave its official answer to the renewed demand of the Communist Party of Great Britain for affiliation. This answer was clear and cogent, and should be applied to Communist activity everywhere. It declared that the Communists are not to be considered as "democratic." Indeed, they look upon democracy "as a bourgeois fraud":

A preference for dictatorship infects their own internal organization. Communist Party policy is decided over the heads of its members. By substituting for freedom of thought and conscience an iron and unquestioning obedience to a party line, imposed from above, they have made their periodical somersaults the laughing stock of the world.

Speaking and thinking in an alien jargon, they are totally insensitive to the thoughts and desires of the normal man and woman.

Referring to foreign policy, the statement speaks of the Labour Party's sympathy with "the workers' régime" in Russia, and stresses its own contribution to the defeat of Germany. It is at least doubtful, it continues, whether the Soviet Union could have resisted Hitler's onslaught if Labour had listened to the Communist call for sabotage



of our war effort. This was, of course, a hint to the Soviet Government, and the hint is subsequently broadened :

Close and friendly relations between Britain and the Soviet Union demand that each nation should respect the other's right to seek social justice and prosperity in its own way.

The automatic subservience of the British Communist party to the imagined wishes of the U.S.S.R., by creating suspicions of Soviet intentions, is a real obstacle to that free association of equal partners which both countries fervently desire.

It is clear that the temporary Communist talk of working-class unity behind the Labour Party is merely a clumsy camouflage for their real aim of breaking up the Labour movement so as to increase their own chances of establishing a party dictatorship.

This answer to the Communist demand for affiliation is clear and forthright. Yet it contains an element of unreality. The Labour leaders know perfectly well that talk about the "imagined wishes of the U.S.S.R." is nonsense ; the Communist Party in Britain, as elsewhere, is instructed in detail from Moscow what tactics it is to employ, and when and how these are to be altered. The "periodical somersaults" may be a "laughing stock," but they were nonetheless dictated by the changing foreign relations of Soviet Russia. There was nothing irresponsible or spontaneous about them. While Russia had her treaty of non-aggression with Germany, from 1939 until June, 1941, Communist parties did all they could to sabotage the war effort of Britain ; once Russia was attacked by Germany, they did their best to further it. It was a "somersault," but fully deliberate, and not indeed a matter for laughter. It would be wise of the Labour leaders, who, on the whole, have shown a sound grasp of foreign policy, to realise that what they have said of the Communist Party in Britain can be said with equal truth about Communist parties everywhere. The attempt to enforce fusion between Social Democrats and Communists in the Russian zone of Germany is a classic instance of that bogus "working-class unity" which the Labour Party Executive pillories as "merely a clumsy camouflage," behind which to set up a Communist dictatorship. In Poland, the Peasant Party of M. Mikolajcyk, which would secure an overwhelming majority in any "free and unfettered" election, is abused and persecuted by the Communist Press and the Communist secret police on the grounds that, in wishing to stand as a separate party in the promised elections, it is destroying that "working-class unity," concerning which the Labour reply was refreshingly outspoken. M. Mikolajcyk and his followers are castigated as "reactionaries" or even downright "Fascists" because they are loath to accept a Communist-officered United or "Popular" Front. It may not be without interest to observe that members of the Labour Government are dubbed "crypto-Tories" by British Communists, on account of their unwillingness to welcome the Communist Party within the Labour fold.

### But not so Simple

**T**HIS unambiguous reply from the Labour Party Executive must not obscure the fact that Communists have made considerable headway within the Labour movement. When the question of affiliation is raised again at the Party Conference at Whitsuntide, it is not so certain that it will be summarily rejected ; it is not certain that it will be rejected at all. Indeed, Communists appear to think there are good chances that it may this time be approved. They claim to have the support of many M.P.'s for affiliation ; they have declared, for example, that nine of the twelve Labour M.P.'s for Manchester and Salford have signed a declaration in its favour. Not long ago, Mr. Eden stated in the House of Commons that the Labour Parliamentary Party had a Communist or pro-Communist fringe of some 30 members ; and a study, in Hansard, of the questions asked in the present Parliament appears to bear this out. But it is not among Labour M.P.'s or in local Labour organizations that Communist influence is most forcibly to be detected. Local Labour organizations know their Communists only too well. It is within certain Trade Unions that Communist pressure is growing. Not that the men are Communist as opposed to Labour or even markedly pro-Communist. But members of the Communist Party have been very active, have infiltrated into key positions, and have carried through, at local and branch meetings, resolutions supporting the affiliation of the Communist Party with British Labour. The membership of the Communist Party remains small ; but it has sympathisers who are not members, and are ready to act for it, partly in its interest and partly in their own. It has exploited the "myth" of Soviet Russia, as a country run by and for the working class ; talks in terms of "working-class unity" ; and has at its service an efficient propaganda, well subsidized and distributed. What Labour leaders fear is that Communists may exercise an influence, out of all proportion to their numbers and importance, on the block votes, cast by Trade Unions at the coming Party Conference. At the last conference, the National Union of Mineworkers—the largest affiliated body—had a vote of well over 400,000. The Trade Union block votes totalled 2,393,000 while the voting strength of local Labour parties totalled only 524,000. Unions, voting thus as blocks, may have been sufficiently worked upon to favour the affiliation of the Communist Party or may see little harm in granting the reiterated request for such affiliation. That Labour leaders are aware of this danger is clear from the statement of their Executive. This declared that the Communists were negligible, when it came to an open contest, but were a menace as a fifth column "manipulating block votes behind the scenes." It is not difficult to surmise the disastrous consequences of such an affiliation, both in the Labour Party itself and on the foreign policy of Britain.

### Russian Security

FOR a long time now, we have been informed that we must take account of justified Russian suspicions of the West and of Russian plans for her own security. All this is wearing very thin. That the Russian Government is intensely suspicious is true enough. Even in Czarist times, the Russians were suspicious of Europe and Europeans. The Soviet authorities have succeeded in building up their internal economy—if they have succeeded in doing so—only because they have clamped down an iron security curtain between the Russian people and the rest of the world. Mr. Paul Winterton's recent *Report on Russia*, written from personal experience after three years as war correspondent in Moscow, shows how every unofficial contact with Russians was made impossible. Indeed, this process of isolation, coupled with the misrepresentation of Europe and America as lands of slavery and exploitation, existing at a social and economic level far inferior to that inside Russia, has been so continuous and so radical that it is difficult to imagine how it could be reversed, without the collapse of the Bolshevik system. Yet international collaboration is no mere matter of agreement between governments, on the loftiest plane; it demands some mutual understanding between peoples. This understanding the Russians simply do not possess, nor can they acquire it, as they are at present circumstanced. The grim reluctance of Russian and Ukrainian prisoners of war and displaced persons to return to their countries—a reluctance which made them not infrequently prefer suicide to repatriation—is a convincing, if pathetic, evidence of their disillusionment. On the larger matter of national security, the defeat of Germany has given Russia a security as she never enjoyed it before. Germany defeated, Russia is secure. Why, therefore, this attempt to control absolutely the neighbouring countries of East-Central Europe? And to control them, not through the natural influence of an adjacent great Power, but through puppet administrations and secret police, with all the terrorist accompaniment of deportation and liquidation? These States are not interested in a revival of nationalist Germany, unless the Soviet tyranny becomes so oppressive that their memories of Nazi cruelty will be less bitter than their present experiences of Soviet domination. If Russia desires friendly relations with these countries, she can best obtain them by withdrawing her armies Eastwards and removing her political puppets and secret police, to permit these countries to find governments for themselves through the ordinary process of a free election, and to set about their heavy tasks of reconstruction after their own manner and in accordance with their national and cultural traditions. Russia's security is further guaranteed by her membership of U.N.O. and her permanent seat on the Security Council; the more seriously she co-operates with other Powers within that international framework, the greater will her security become. However, continual anti-British

propaganda emanating from Moscow and various "wars of nerves," e.g., against Canada and Turkey, are not exactly indications that she has discovered the path to true security, in co-operation with other States. Further, the vague insinuations that certain "political groups" are preparing for another war are as dangerous as they are without foundation. If we are to judge by military preparedness and by the maintenance of large armies, Eastern Europe is the proper centre for alarm. The fourth Five Year Plan, recently approved for Russia—*Red Star* declared, on March 19th—"opens up new prospects for increasing the might and strengthening the military power of the Soviet State." Is this all in the cause of national security? Are the countries, bordering upon Russia, over which she is seeking to extend an absolute control, really meant to be defensive buffers, as pro-Russians would have us imagine? Or are they bridge-heads for further attack and for longer-range penetration? The existence in Eastern Europe of vast Russian armies, on a war footing, while Britain and the United States have been hastily demobilising their land forces should make us think rather in terms of Anglo-Saxon rather than Russian security. Reliable reports suggest that the occupying Soviet troops in Hungary and the Balkans have been further increased since the close of 1945. Why, it may be asked, must Russia maintain such armies, when her needs of reconstruction are so great? Russian soldiers, we learn, have been helping on the land in Hungary and Roumania. It would be better for the peace of mind of the world if they were working on their own land, in civilian and not military attire.

### Outlook over Europe

**A**N observer, believing that all peoples have the right to liberty and independence and accepting the ideals so frequently enunciated during the war, e.g., in the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms, would regard the present position of Europe as very sad and gloomy. Many countries do not possess this freedom, for which they fought; among them, Poland, whose right to liberty and independence was the challenge that summoned Britain and France to war; and Yugoslavia, that "found its soul" in resistance, at such bitter cost, to the Nazis. From the three Baltic States, now submerged in Russia, to the countries of the Balkans, there is an arc of countries—some completely dominated, others strongly influenced by Russia, not one of them properly free. Even in Austria and Hungary, where reasonably free elections have been held and governments have been returned with a markedly non-Communist character, Russian pressure is still exerted. Lately, the Russian authorities in Vienna refused to sanction the new Austrian constitution, drawn up by the government, while in Hungary, the Smallholders' party which has an absolute majority in the country, was compelled to expel twenty of its elected members of Parliament—among them figures prominent from the



commencement of the movement—on the grounds that they were “reactionaries.” In Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Roumania and Albania, the government is in the hands of a minority party, that of the Communists, with a number of small splinter parties, Communist-controlled—to create the illusion of “democracy” and a united front. In all of these countries, with the possible exception of Yugoslavia, and there not on account of popular support for the Tito régime but because of a strong Tito army, the minority government would at once disappear, were Russian troops and Russian support to be withdrawn. The settlement of East-Central Europe depends, in the first place, on this retirement of Russian troops, and, in the second place, on reasonably free elections, which will bring in new governments that roughly correspond with the wishes and aspirations of the people. Those elections have been promised, even guaranteed. Could they ever be realised, and could external pressure be removed, there would be very good chances of stable administration in these as in practically all European countries. What these countries want, is order out of chaos; peace after strife and upheavals; reconstruction to succeed to privation and ruin. To speak of a “revolutionary” temper on the Continent is nonsense. The people desire to save what can be saved from the disaster, and want to be left alone to save it. They favour social reform but then, war has been a great leveller, and, when all have suffered, social distinctions have scant significance. The development of Catholic or mainly Catholic parties, whose “progressive” character is tempered with a sane “conservative” determination to preserve whatever may be preserved, and yet whose conservatism is allied to projects of social reform and reconstruction, is a marked feature of those countries on the Continent, where freedom of political expression is possible. And these parties, in Western and Southern Europe, have their counterparts in the Peasant parties of Roumania and Bulgaria, as in the *Volkspartei* of Austria and in the movement of the Smallholders in Hungary. They represent a new conservatism, adapted to the conditions of to-day and fully alive to social needs, in the spirit of the Catholic teaching on social problems, as it has been elaborated in the encyclicals of the Popes, from Leo XIII to Pius XII. They represent a popular conservatism, because they have the support of peasants and also of large sections of the middle classes. If only elections can be freely held and the conditions for a proper functioning of democratic government be assured, these parties will play a highly important and a very valuable part in the re-establishment of Europe. Nor should one forget here that, after experience of Communist control and domination, the various Socialist and Social-Democratic parties are learning moderation. The very existence—to their “Left”—of a more extreme political movement is driving them towards the “Centre.” Collaboration between Continental Socialists and Catholics before 1939 was no easy matter, because of the materialistic philosophy and the anti-clericalism and even anti-



religious policies of the Socialists. If and when a freer political setting be provided, such collaboration ought to be much less difficult, and it might be extremely fruitful.

### Visitors Report on Poland

**D**URING the last few months a number of public men and journalists have visited Poland. Their reports, some of them written outside of Poland, tell a story of desperate economic circumstances, of political tyranny and oppression, of arrests, intimidation and secret police, of rigid control of all means of public influence. Some of them have been collected in a volume, *Poland To-Day, as seen by Foreign Observers*. One visitor in autumn, 1945, was Mr. T. S. Gordon, representative of Michigan in the U.S. Congress. His verdict is very forthright :

Much as every Pole wants food, fuel and clothing, he wants freedom more. The spirit of the Polish people is not broken. The man in the street is not afraid to die. He prefers death to life under the present political set-up. If an impartial, free, and unfettered election could be held in Poland without tickets being prepared in advance, without arrests and deportations, the Polish people would wipe out the Government of Bierut and Osobka-Morawski. However, should the present situation persist, Poland will quickly be turned into a Soviet province, ruled by Soviet police, despite the fact that Russia will fail to communize the Christian Polish people and to imbue the God-fearing Poles with the Soviet totalitarian doctrines.

Mr. Gordon's report, which spoke of Russian pillage, rape and terrorism, concluded with the following paragraph, addressed to his countrymen :

All the Poles want is to have the present state of things changed as quickly as possible. They want to get rid of the rapacious Soviet Army. They want to get rid of the N.K.V.D. (secret police). They want to get rid of the Government which assumed power backed by Soviet bayonets, and they want help to regain their freedom and independence. They want America and the whole world to redeem the pledges which were given to them, they want the obligations of the world towards Poland to be fulfilled, they want all of us to help them again to become a free, democratic, and independent nation.

Mr. Charles Lambert of the *Daily Herald* declared that this "new Poland" was not a democracy in the British sense. Government circles had spoken of it as a "semi-democracy" ; Mr. Lambert preferred to call it a "semi-dictatorship." Mr. E. J. Williams, of the *Christian Science Monitor*, reported that practically all senior Army officers speak only Russian, and that "when a person calls a Polish government department on the telephone, he is often answered by a person who is unable to speak any Polish—only Russian." Poland to-day is smaller than in 1939, and has only two-thirds of its former population ; yet its security organizations are four times their pre-

1939 number. "These Polish security organizations, the Poles themselves admit, are at a low moral and intellectual level, and generally are under Communist control." Referring to political prisoners, Mr. Williams gave the number of 20,000, on what he considered reliable information, but other writers have spoken of 70,000, even 100,000. Mr. Gladwin Hill, of the *New York Times*, has reported :

However, other Government officials have acknowledged to me that there were between 60,000 and 80,000 (political prisoners,) with the stipulation that the bulk of them are *Volksdeutsch*—Polish-Germans or Germanized Poles. The belief is widespread in Warsaw that there are 10,000 in Cracow alone, and some responsible observers think the total may be nearer 100,000.

The former German concentration camp at Oswiecim, whose name to any Pole is synonymous with horror, is operating again under "Polish" auspices, and its wire fences have been charged with electricity.

French journalists, representing *Carrefour*, *L'Aube*, *Figaro*, *Dernière Paris* and *Temps Présent* tell the same story, of economic distress and political oppression, of the Soviet seizure of Polish raw materials, and of a controlled and subservient press, almost entirely in Communist hands. On February 25th and 26th, the *Daily Telegraph* published an account by Major Tufton Beamish, M.P., of his recent experiences in Poland. This included a notice of his visit to Cardinal Sapieha, "the greatest moral force in Poland to-day," and his talks with members of the Provisional administration. His verdict squares with those already cited, and the note upon which he ends must find an echo in every honest mind :

We have a duty to Poland to see that the terms of the Yalta Agreement are faithfully carried out. We can best provide a token of our good faith by initiating arrangements for an international commission to visit Poland at once to advise and assist the Provisional Government in the conduct of the forthcoming elections, and by making it abundantly clear that if the agreed terms on which the Provisional Government was recognized continue to be violated, recognition will be withdrawn.

The future greatness of Poland is not in doubt. These deeply religious, cultured and intensely national people were our Allies from the first day of the war to the last. No nation has suffered more. It would be a tragedy that must not, that will not, happen, if they should suffer still further from want of understanding on the part of the United States and ourselves, of what is taking place.

### Persecution in Eastern Europe

ON December 23rd, 1945, Pope Pius XII issued an encyclical, *Orientales Omnes Ecclesias*, which spoke of the history of the Ruthenian Catholic Church and of the savage persecution to which it was now being subjected by the Soviet authorities, with the "moral"

assistance of the Moscow Patriarch. A month earlier, Mgr. Senyshyn, Auxiliary Bishop of the Ruthenian Rite in the U.S.A., addressing the representatives of the American hierarchy, had stated that Soviet rule in what were formerly Poland's Eastern provinces :

has been a ruinous one. Brutal enforcements, seizure of cultural possessions, confiscation of Catholic religious institutions, heavy pressure aimed at making Catholics join the Orthodox Church, killing and imprisoning the clergy and outstanding persons—these things give a brief but clear picture of the devastation and enslavement wrought.

In a booklet, published jointly by the *Tablet* and the *Sword of the Spirit*, and reviewed elsewhere in these pages, Michael Derrick gives the history of the Ruthenian Catholic Church which, after its sad experience of schism, was reconciled with the Holy See towards the close of the sixteenth century and since then, despite discrimination and persecution from Russian authorities in the nineteenth century, has remained stoutly loyal to the Catholic faith and the see of Rome. And now the British public has been led to understand—by a casual paragraph in the *Times* and, still more unpardonably, by short notices in non-Catholic Church papers—that these loyal Catholics have apostatized in favour of Russian Orthodoxy. Mr. Derrick's booklet should be read and re-read by Catholics ; and then re-printed over and over again, to bring home the real facts of this disgraceful and inhuman persecution of the Ruthenes which a smug journalism can cover up with a few glib phrases about "secession." During the first Soviet occupation of Eastern Poland, where most Ruthenes live, the Russian authorities were hostile but at first cautious. As they grew more conscious of their strength, so grew their hostility ; hundreds of Catholic priests were sent to Siberia during 1940. Since the return of Soviet troops, in 1944 and 1945, oppression has become active persecution. All archbishops and bishops of the Ruthenian Catholic Church have been arrested ; and four of them, the Archbishop of Lwów, the Bishop of Stanisławów, with the auxiliary Bishops for Stanisławów and Przemyśl have died in prison. The framework of Ruthenian Church organization has been ruthlessly destroyed. Orthodox ministers have been sent into these provinces to suborn the faithful and encourage them to apostatize. The resistance of the Ruthenian clergy has been heroic. But at what a human sacrifice ? Mr. Derrick writes :

During the late summer and autumn of 1945, the Rector of the Major Seminary at Lwów, Dr. J. Chorisk, and all the superiors of religious houses in the city, were imprisoned. Some 500 priests of the Ruthenian diocese of Lwów were imprisoned during this period also. The Rector of the Ruthenian seminary at Stanisławów died in prison, like the two bishops of his diocese. Among martyrs whose total numbers we dare not estimate were four alumni of the College of Propaganda in Rome : Dr. N. Hrynyk, of the diocese of Przemyśl, Dr. A. Shirok, parish priest

at Vola Cholojewska, Father V. Durbak, and a young priest whose uncle, Mgr. Janko Simrak, is Uniate Bishop of Krizevci and has been in one of Marshal Tito's prisons since the summer of 1945 . . . The names of martyrs which reach this country are few out of many thousands. The scene of many of the martyrdoms is the salt-mines near Dobromil, into which victims are thrown alive and from which they cannot escape. Large numbers of Ukrainians have been put to death at Sambor.

### This Reported "Secession"

**I**N their persecution of Ruthenian Catholics the Soviet authorities have adopted their favourite "minority" technique. They have discovered, through promises or threats, a small handful of priests willing to be their tools. Three of them, Drs. Kostelnyk and Kladochni and Father Pelvetskij, formed, in May, 1945, what is called "The Committee of Initiative for the Transference of the Greek Catholics to Orthodoxy," shortly after the Moscow Patriarch had addressed a letter to the Ruthenian Catholics, inviting their apostacy, and concerned with denunciation of the Vatican and with eminently Christian references to Hitler as a "bloodthirsty madman" and a "cannibal." This Committee of Initiative published two letters, both dated May 28th, 1945: the first, to the Ruthenian Catholics; the second, to the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukraine. The latter spoke of the "Uniate Church" as an historic anachronism, lauded the "incomparable Stalin" and asked that the Committee be authorized to begin its work—a work, already declared, in the first letter, to be mainly that of denouncing all who would not renounce their Catholic loyalty in favour of the new Orthodoxy under Soviet pressure. One paragraph in the reply received by them from the Ukrainian Soviet is very significant:

As the registration of Greek Catholic deaneries, parishes and religious houses proceeds, the Committee of Initiative must send to the representative of the Council of People's Commissars for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church on the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukrainian S.S.R., the list of deans, priests and superiors of religious houses *who refuse to submit themselves to the Committee of Initiative for the transference of the Greek Catholic Church to the Orthodox Church.*

This reply is dated June 18th, 1945; there was no mention of bishops; these had been all imprisoned. Despite this persecution, only 42 Ruthenian priests, out of 2,700, had associated themselves, by the end of June, 1945, with this Committee. It is this Committee of three apostate clerics, with a handful of intimidated adherents, who have pretended to speak in the name of the Ruthenian Catholic people and have claimed that they could transfer to the ecclesiastical department of an atheistic State the allegiance of a Catholic people.

# YUGOSLAVIA

## WEST OR EAST?

"There is no race which has shown a more heroic desire for freedom than the Serbs, or achieved it with less aid from others or at more sacrifice to itself."

PROF. H. W. V. TEMPERLEY.

**I**N recent times the opinion has often been expressed in the newspapers of this country that Eastern and South-Eastern Europe are so closely connected with the East that it is altogether natural—if not inevitable—that they should enter and remain exclusively in the Soviet sphere of interest.

Yugoslavia is one of the countries of South-Eastern Europe, and her population, as everyone knows, consists of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.

In the case of the Croats and Slovenes, who are Catholics and were for centuries subjects of the Habsburg Monarchy, it is quite clear that they belong to the civilization of Western Europe. Their subjection to the Roman Curia and the Apostolic Monarchy is sufficient proof that they have very little in common with the East.

We must now inquire how this matter stands with the Serbs, who represent over half of the Slav population of Yugoslavia. For centuries they were independent and possessed a State of their own, which meant that they were subject to various influences but were able to choose between them, as between East and the West.

Many people believe that the Serbs received their language, their alphabet and their religion from the Russians, and see in this a proof that Serbian civilization is, if not identical with, at least very closely related to the Russian.

It cannot be doubted that in the distant past all the Slavs were one people and spoke a single Slavonic language. Linguistic researches have, however, established that, sometime before the Slavs settled in their present homelands in the third century A.D., there already existed among them three dialects out of which their present languages have developed. These basic dialects were : the Eastern, from which are derived the Great, Little and White Russian ; the North-Western, later branching out into Polish, Czech and Slovak ; and the South-Western, from which the Serbo-Croatian, Slovene and Bulgarian languages are derived.

After the first common Slavonic language had given birth to these three groups, each of them began to live a life of its own and, independently of the others, to develop its own linguistic peculiarities.

The speech of the Southern Slavs—from which Serbian later



emerged—was the first Slavonic language to acquire an alphabet (in the IXth century) and so became the first Slavonic literary language.

In the XVth century, when the Turks occupied the whole of the Balkan Peninsula, this language—or rather the Serbian variety of it—was even used by certain European Courts. It was used by the Sultan Amurath II (1401-1451) when he wrote to the Republic of Ragusa in 1430 and 1442, by the Hungarian King Matthias Corvinus (1443-1490) when in 1465 he wrote to the Ragusan Brother Alexander, and even by the Emperor Sigismund (1411-1437) when, between 1418 and 1429, he published several Edicts in Serbian.

It follows from all this that it is as absurd to suggest that Serbian derives from Russian, or Russian from Bulgarian, as it is that French derives from Italian or Italian from Spanish.

The Slavs, while they still spoke a common language, possessed no alphabet. They acquired one much later, in the second half of the ninth century.

The apostles, Cyril and Methodius, both of them Balkan Slavs, had already—according to the English philologist Taylor—before their departure in 864 for Moravia composed a special alphabet, derived mostly from the Greek, for use in Slavonic liturgical books. They called it “Glagolitic” and used it to write down their translation of liturgical books into the language at that time spoken in the Balkan Peninsula.

At the beginning of the Xth century the pupils of these apostles were driven out of Moravia, where they were preaching Christianity, and settled in the Balkans, where one of them, by name Clement, perfected this alphabet and, out of respect for his teacher, called it “Cyrillic.” While the Glagolitic script survived in Croatia not only in ecclesiastical but in general use (a Glagolitic missal was printed in Croatia as late as 1893, in the time of Bishop Strossmayer), in Serbia it was quickly superseded by the Cyrillic.

This language, for which Clement created a special alphabet, remained literary Serbian until the beginning of the XIXth century, although it had for various reasons become quite different from the popular speech.

It is to the Serbian philologist, Vuk Stephanovich-Karadgich (1787-1864), that the Serbs owe it that the pure speech of the people became a literary language. For this language he created an alphabet, which was called “Vukitsa” after its creator. Since it is the most phonetic, it can be considered one of the most perfect of European alphabets. With his script, Stephanovich, as it were, “fixed” the purest Serbian language and put into effect his own basic principle, which he had summed up as early as 1814 in the phrase: “Write as you speak, and read as you have written.”

Thus, the first Serbian alphabet, the Glagolitic, was composed by two Southern Slavs; the second, the Cyrillic, by the pupils of the first

Slav apostles ; and the third, Vuk's alphabet which the Serbs use to this day, by a Serb born in the village of Trshich, which is near the Bosnian border of Serbia.

Having become Christians in the IXth and Xth centuries, the Serbs, already wishing to have a Slav rite of their own, accepted the authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople. The division of the Balkan Peninsula into Church dioceses under Leo the Isaurian, and the limitation of Papal jurisdiction in the territory, gave rise to disputes between Byzantium and Rome. During these disturbances, the Patriarch of Constantinople then at Nicaea, gave in 1219, at the request of Sava, its ecclesiastical autonomy to Serbia. Thus, the Serbian Church freed herself from the influence exercised over her by the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

Dr. Elizabeth Hill<sup>1</sup> maintains that " the greatest name of medieval Serbia is St. Sava, the monk, the astute politician, the able statesman, the first Serbian archbishop, the founder of the rich Serbian medieval literature, which fed the other Slav peoples, including the Russians. St. Sava is the energetic consolidator of the Christian tradition in Serbia."

From that time the autocephalous Serbian Orthodox Church developed in complete independence, being not so much a State as a popular organization. There are many examples, both in earlier and in later times, of disagreement between the Church and unpopular governments. And in conflicts between the people and such governments, the Serbian Church being a thoroughly popular organization always sided with the people.

In the XIVth century under the Emperor Dushan (1331-1354), the Serbian Church raised itself in 1346 to the dignity of a Patriarchate. But when the last Serbian State fell in 1459, the Serbs lost their religious freedom. The Turks abolished the Patriarchate which was only restored in 1557. After the Austro-Turkish war of 1739 which ended with the Treaty of Belgrade, the Patriarch Arsenius IV, who had given umbrage to the Turks, was obliged to leave Serbia. Thus, the Serbian Patriarchate came to an end for the second time, to be re-established in 1848 at Carlowitz. From 1766 onwards the Serbs inside Turkish territory were subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople.

The Serbs, while they were under Turkish domination, had very few printing presses ; the first press was established at Obod near Tsetinyé in Montenegro, where the first, not only Serbian but Slavonic, book was printed in 1493, eleven years after Caxton opened his shop at Westminster. But after 1563 all printing ceased in territory inhabited by the Serbs.

It was no longer possible to get Church books from the Patriarchate

<sup>1</sup> *The Spirit of Kossovo*, an address delivered on Vidovdan, June 28th, 1945, by Elizabeth Hill, M.A., Ph.D., Cambridge University Lecturer in Slavonic. Printed for the Servian Orthodox Church in London.

of Constantinople, which had become completely hellenized. For a time the Serbs got Church books printed in Cyrillic from Venice. But as the proselytizing zeal of Austria caused them to be prosecuted, the Serbs were obliged towards the end of the XVIIth century to seek printed books for Church use from Orthodox Russia.

This was the first contact between Serbs and Russians, for, as may be gathered from the above account, the Serbian Orthodox Church had had no other contact with the Russian.

The first Serbian King, King Stephen the First, (1196-1223), was crowned by a Legate of Pope Innocent III (1198-1216).

During the Crusades the European nations made their choice, and the Serbs, choosing to become a Crusader nation, were recognized as such by the Pope. It is since that date that they have in their coat of arms the Crusader's Cross.

The Renaissance finds expression in the works of the Serbian painters of the XIIIth century, the contemporaries and even precursors of the artists of the Trecento in Siena and Florence.

The Serbian feudal régime was patterned on Western feudalism.

The first Serbian Code of criminal and civil law, Emperor Dushan's (1331-1354) Code, was one of the most liberal of the time. It was not conceived under Eastern influence, and it was one of the first codifications after the Roman Law. When feudalism prevailed throughout Europe, the Emperor Dushan in 1349 submitted the first part, and in 1354 the second part of his Code to the vote of the Sabor or medieval Serbian Assembly at Skoplyé. The Code of Dushan forbade the judges to execute the Emperor's own orders if such orders were contrary to the law. Dushan's Code also allowed Serbian serfs to take legal proceedings against the Emperor himself and decreed that judges must plead on their behalf. In taking the oath of allegiance to his own Code, Dushan the Mighty took the original text in his hands, ascended the Throne and raised the Code above his head to impress upon the Assembly that the Emperor stood above its members, but that the Code was above the Emperor.

Emperor Stephen-Dushan entered into negotiations with Pope Innocent VI (1352-1362) to get himself appointed Captain of the Christian Army against the Turks. But he died suddenly in 1354.

Gabriel Millet himself maintains that the Court of Emperor Dushan attracted great talents from all lands—Saxon miners, German knights, Dalmatian financiers, Venetian and Florentine merchants.

In 1389 the Serbs became the "Guardians of the Gate" and lost their independence in fighting for the West and for Christian civilization at Kossovo. The last Christian medieval State of Serbia ceased to exist in 1459, but European civilization was saved, partly by Serbian efforts and sacrifices.

Throughout the Middle Ages the Serbs either had no contact with the Russians or, if they had, it was so insignificant that the Russians are not mentioned in the numerous Serbian written memorials of that time.

Serbia's past is connected either with the West proper or with Byzantium, whose civilization was not Eastern but was the direct inheritor of the culture of Greece and Rome.

In the great conflict between East and West, which ended in 1453 with the capture of Constantinople by the Sultan Mahomet II (1451-1481), the Serbs fought on the side of the West, to lose their independence as a State at Kossovo.

This firm attitude of the Serbs made an impression even in England, where Thomas Goffe, M.A., of Oxford University, wrote a play about the Battle of Kossovo. This play was acted by the students of Christ Church in 1618. It was first published in 1632 under the title of "The Courageous Turk or Amurath the First." Although the play does not bear their name, the Serbs were its real heroes.

The importance which the West attached to the issue of the battle at Kossovo is made evident by the fact that Charles VI of France, the "Well-Beloved" (1368-1422), being falsely informed that the Turks had been defeated, gave orders that, in celebration of the Christian victory over Islam, the bells should ring in the famous Abbey of St. Denis, the resting place of the Kings of France.

Suspicious of everything that came from Vienna and Budapest because he felt that it was directed against his people, the Serbian Metropolitan of Carlowitz, Moses, turned, in the beginning of the XVIIIth century, to Russia, which had just become, under Peter the Great, one of the Great Powers. In 1726 there arrived in Carlowitz the first Russian teacher, Maxim Suvoroff, who brought with him a considerable number of grammar and school books and founded the "Slavonic School," which was, however, to close down as early as 1730.

After the death of the Metropolitan Moses, his successor, Vichentiyé, again applied to Russia, and in 1733 there arrived in Carlowitz another Russian teacher, Emmanuel Kozachinsky, together with six assistant teachers. They founded the "Latin School," which closed down in 1737 after working for only four years.

Though both these Russian schools, the "Slavonic School" and the "Latin School" (1726-1730 and 1733-1737 respectively), were active for only a very short time, their influence on the later development of the Serbian literary language was of great significance. The Russian masters brought Russian school books with them, and they introduced the Russian-Slavonic Church language into the schools in place of Serbian. Threatened on one side by Austria and by Turkey on the other, the Serbs began to get all their printed books from Russia and



the general belief arose that, in the interests of Orthodoxy, the language of those books ought not to be altered.

It was during this period that Peter the Great initiated his anti-Turkish policy. He made contact with Montenegro and laid the foundation of a lasting friendship between the vast Russian Empire and the tiny Serb Principality, whose "effect," according to the Oxford History of Serbia, "was psychological and financial" rather than anything else.<sup>1</sup>

The Russian-Slavonic Church language soon passed into Serbian literary usage. The Serbs, especially during the reign of Maria-Theresa (1740-1780), when Orthodoxy as such was still threatened, accepted this language and looked upon it as the guardian of their faith and their nationality. They did this the more easily because they believed—this was later proved to be false—that the language of the Russian Orthodox Church was the common ancestor of all the Slavonic languages.

The Serbs called this language *Slavjanoserbski* (Slavo-Serbian), and in the second half of the XVIIIth century the russification of the Serbian literary language had gone so far that Russian books were just simply reprinted for Serbian use.

This situation lasted until almost the end of the XVIIIth century, during the second half of which the influence of Church Russian on the Serbian literary language was undeniably very great.

The Serbian writer, Zahariyé Orfeline (1726-1785), reacted against the Russian influence in Serbian literature. In 1761 he published in Venice a work called "The Grief of Serbia," in which he used a more or less pure popular vocabulary. He also published in 1765 the first Serbian Review.

Then came the Classicism of Lukian Mushitski (1777-1837), who, taking Horace for his model, produced odes.

Finally, the regenerator of Serbian literature, Dossitiyé Obradovich (1742-1811), was the first to argue the case for the rejection of the "Slavo-Serbian" language, which the people did not use, and the adoption for literary purposes of the popular language. There are two distinct periods in Obradovich's literary career, first a Greek phase and then a Western European, when he was under the influence of the Western philosophers who were leading the attack against religious prejudices.

A member of a Masonic Lodge, Obradovich was greatly influenced by Rousseau, Voltaire, Diderot and Marmontel, by Lessing, and by Addison and Johnson. He visited the whole of Western Europe and spent a long time in Austria, Germany, France, England, Holland and Italy. He knew Greek, Latin, Italian, German, French and English,

<sup>1</sup> *The Balkans, a History of Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece, Rumania and Turkey*, by Nevill Forbes, Arnold J. Toynbee, D. Mitrany and D. G. Hogarth. Oxford University Press, 1915.



and he wrote many books giving an account of his travels and of the information he had come by. It appears that he also went to Russia but it is not known for certain what he did there.

The reformer of the Serbian language and the creator of the modern Serbian alphabet, Vuk Stephanovich-Karadgich (1787-1864), was greatly influenced by the German Romantics. Inspired by Kopitar and Goethe, with whom he was on friendly terms, he belonged to the *Volksgeist Schule* and sought the spirit of Serbia in her popular poetry. John Bowring translated into English some of the national poems collected by Stephanovich.

Stephanovich laid the foundations not only of Serbian literature but of the entire national culture. In his "Serbian Dictionary," published in Vienna in 1818, the speech of the people was for the first time raised to the dignity of a literary language and the system of spelling which the Serbs use to this day created and fixed. His grammar of the Serbian language was translated into German and Jacob Grimm wrote the introduction to the German edition.

The Serbian philologist, George Danichich (1825-1882), was also, as the pupil of Kopitar and Stephanovich, under the influence of the German school of philology.

Thus Obradovich, Stephanovich and Danichich, the founders of modern Serbian literature and the creators of a pure literary language based on popular speech and free from foreign influences, were themselves the pure products of Western civilization and had no significant contact with the East.

The first half of the XIXth century saw the victory of German, and to a lesser extent of English and Hungarian, influences on Serbian literature.

John Yovanovich (1833-1904) was powerfully influenced by Heine, while Lazar Kostich (1841-1910) was subject sometimes to German and sometimes to English literary influences. The works of Goethe and Schiller were the most often translated into Serbian. French influences were still weak. The works of a few writers of the second class were translated and John Steriya Popovich (1805-1856) wrote some comedies in the style of Molière.

The Russian influence on Serbian literature began to make itself felt only in the second half of the XIXth century through the translations of Gogol, Turgenev and Goncharov and, much later, of Tolstoy and Dostoyevski. It was particularly evident in the realistic tales of Milovañ Glishich (1847-1908) and Lazar Lazarevich (1851-1890), though the latter had studied in Germany.

At the end of the XIXth century, after the appearance of the famous critics and literary historians, John Skerlich (1877-1914) and Bogdan Popovich (1863-1944), Serbian literature fell almost exclusively under French influences, which lasted until the entry of Yugoslavia into the war that has just finished. Whole generations were brought up on the ideas of St. Beuve, Taine and Lemaitre.

English influences were also felt as well as those of the French, though much later, as a result of numerous translations of Shakespeare, Dickens, Thackeray, Eliot, Sterne, Tennyson, Carlyle, Byron and others.

Except for Slavonic philology, Russian science was quite unknown in Serbia before the Revolution of 1917, when a number of Russian professors were received into Belgrade University.

The first Serbian historians, John Rayich (1726-1801), Vuk Stephanovich-Karadgich (1787-1864), Panteliya Srechovich (1834-1903), Lyubomir Kovachevich (1848-1918) were self-taught, while later on they belonged to the Viennese School, e.g., Vladimir Chorovich (1885-1941) and Stanoyé Stanoyevich (1874-1936).

The study of law developed during the first part of the XIXth century under the inspiration of the liberal South German jurists. Later it came under almost exclusive influence of French and Belgian Law.

It was from the great thinkers of Germany and Britain—and to a lesser extent of France—that the Serbs learnt their philosophy. Their knowledge of the technical sciences, of economics and of medicine came chiefly from Germany. Serbian painters and sculptors studied in Munich, Paris, Rome, Vienna and Budapest.

In the first half of the XIXth century a certain number of Serbian theologians—of whom the best known was the Metropolitan Michael (1826-1898)—were educated in Russia. Later on, they ceased altogether to get their schooling in that country. Students went rather to the Orthodox Faculty of Theology at Chalchis and Athens, to the Catholic Faculty at Fribourg and to the Protestant Faculty at Tübingen, some even went to Oxford. Those who wished to make a special study of Slavonic theology went to Czernowitz.

The first Serbian regular army was organized under purely French influences. When it was established in 1861, a French officer, Colonel Hypolite Mondin, was appointed the first Minister of War for Serbia.

Until the Austro-Serbian Tariff War of 1904, almost all Serbian export went to Austria-Hungary. But after 1904 Serbia sought other markets and found them in the West, sending her goods to them via Salonika. There was hardly any trade with Russia. In 1909 Serbian imports and exports were together worth 145,243,800 gold francs, of which 894,000 francs represented the value of her trade with Russia, 95,010,200 with Austria and 4,878,800 with Britain. In 1933 Yugoslav imports and exports were worth 7,349 million dinars. There was no trade with Russia, while the trade with Italy was worth 1,352 millions and with Britain nearly 512 millions.

The French Revolution of 1789 strengthened the national consciousness of all the European peoples. The first of the Southern Slavs to

fight for their independence were the Serbs, who in 1804 took up arms under the command of George Petrovich-Karageorge.

They began by soliciting the assistance and protection of Austria, who received their proposals coldly. It was by no means in her interest that a Slav Orthodox State should emerge beyond her Southern frontiers.

Having been coldly received by Austria, the Serbs appealed to Russia and France. They sent one deputation to Petrograd, the capital of the greatest Orthodox State, and another to Paris, where the right of the peoples to an independent life was first proclaimed.

With the growth of Serbian independence, the relations between Serbia and Russia were completely bound up with the general international situation. During the first period of their struggle for liberation from the Turkish yoke, the Serbs gained nothing, either good or bad, except as an indirect consequence of the various permutations through which Russo-Turkish relations and the so-called Eastern Question passed.

Although the Russians gave no systematic support to the Serbs in their struggle for independence, it was due to their intervention that the Porte issued the Hatti-Sherifs of 1830 and 1833, which recognised Serbian autonomy and the hereditary character of the princely dignity.

After Serbian autonomy had been won from the Porte, Russia immediately tried to meddle in the purely domestic concerns of Serbia. This behaviour led to difficulties. Colonel Hodges, the first British Consul, had just arrived in Belgrade and Prince Milosh looked to Britain to liberate him from dependence on Russia. But in 1839 Milosh lost his throne and was obliged to leave his country.

With the accession of Prince Alexander Karageorgevich (1842), Serbia again inclined towards the West as the Prince could not forget that Russia had been opposed in 1842 to his election, which was declared null and void at her request. He was elected a second time in 1843.

Serbia remained neutral in the conflict between East and West during the Crimean War (1854-1855). She neither wished to fight against Russia, which had done more than any other power in the diplomatic field to help her to gain her autonomy, nor against the West to which she belonged culturally. Because she had adopted this attitude, Serbia's status—hitherto guaranteed by Russia alone—was, at the Congress of Paris in 1856, placed under the guarantee of all the Great Powers.

Prince Michael (1860-1868) tried in 1863 to gain the sympathy of the British Government. He therefore sent his wife, Princess Julia, accompanied by Philip Christich, a Counsellor of State, to London. But his Turcophil leanings prevented Lord Palmerston from changing his policy with regard to Serbia and the Christians of Turkey.

Serbia then again attached herself to Russia, which was at that time the only Great Power working—though in her own interest—for the complete liberation of the Christians from the Turks. With Russian assistance, Serbia fought two wars against the Turks, in 1876 and in 1877-1878. The Serbian troops were under the command of the Russian General Chernayeff. Yet the Peace of San Stefano (1878) completely disturbed the balance of power, and was directed against Serbian interests to the advantage of Bulgaria.

According to the Oxford History of Serbia,<sup>1</sup> "Serbian public opinion was disillusioned and discontented with the action of Russian diplomacy. But the Powers themselves would not agree to the creation of a Great Bulgaria in which Russian influence would be very strong and which would give her a predominant place in the Balkans. Russia found herself isolated at the Congress of Berlin."

From then onwards, Serbia again turned towards the West. During the first World War, which was essentially a war of the Western Democracies against German Imperialism, Serbia sided with the former.

The Serbs have always felt a certain affection for the Russians. But this affection never had the significance which some people in this country now wish to attribute to it. It was rather the product of a common purpose, the struggle first of all against the Turks and then against Austria-Hungary and her annexionist tendencies in the Balkans.

Serbian affection for the Russians never implied an uncritical adherence to everything coming from Moscow. After the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, all contact with Russia was broken off, and the Serbs' sentimental attachment to that country became an historical memory. The only pro-Soviet political body was the Communist Party, for the other Serbian opposition-parties, opposed to the abolition—however temporary—of Parliamentary government in Yugoslavia, all looked only to France for support.

The best evidence that this was so is the course of events during this war. Moscow, from opportunist motives, was on friendly terms with Germany, while the Yugoslav Communist Press openly attacked France and Great Britain as "warmongers." But the Serbian peasants grieved when in 1940 France was forced to capitulate to Germany. The Serbs then looked, even more than hitherto, for political support to Great Britain although she was, at that time, quite isolated.

The unpopular government then ruling in Belgrade wished, in order to avoid war, to do precisely what Russia had done by concluding the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. But the Serbian people, in spite of Communist propaganda, revolted against the government and deliberately entered the war, hastening to the defence of a democracy which is the distinguishing characteristic of Western civilization.

<sup>1</sup> *The Balkans, ut supra.*



Immediately after the break-up of the Yugoslav army, the Soviet government in the beginning of May, 1941, broke off relations with the Yugoslav government, which had in the meantime been obliged to seek refuge in Britain, and asked the Yugoslav Minister to leave Moscow. This was another proof that Moscow considered that the Serbs had once again taken sides with the West.

In spite of everything, it would seem that the Serbs still sincerely desire to come to an understanding with all peoples. But the agreement with Russia must be one to which the Serbs are really a party, and not the imposition of a Communist ideology by a minority, which is not even Serbian and which yet wishes to force upon the Serbian people a totalitarian system that in no way accords with their traditions and their secular struggle for liberty. The Serbs have always been democrats. "Serbia even in those days (1830)," says the Oxford History of Serbia, was "essentially and uncompromisingly democratic"<sup>1</sup>; and so she has remained to this day.

Geographically, Yugoslavia is half way between the East and the West. Her past, her cultural organizations, literature and art, her science, law and legal institutions, her technicology and, above all, her strong belief in democracy show clearly that she belongs to the civilization of Western Europe.

On the other hand, since she belongs to the group of Slavonic nations, Yugoslavia, like Poland and Czechoslovakia, is in a better position to understand Soviet conceptions. For this reason, she could be, like the other countries of Eastern Europe with a closer knowledge of Russia, not a cause of dissension but a link between the West, to which she belongs, and the East.

C. E. POLSON.

<sup>1</sup> *The Balkans, ut supra.*

---

#### SHORT NOTICE

##### FICTION

If you have read any of Father Bernard Basset's stories as they have appeared in various periodicals, you will want to read the series collected in *Marjorie and Me* (Douglas Organ : 6s. n.). If you have not come across this *Maupassant à rebours*—for war-time restrictions on paper have made paupers of us all—you will probably bear him a grudge. For the reading of these stories will have made you sit up late or will have made you neglect to write this or that important letter. The intertwining of observation, insight and humour will have fascinated you ; and every boy of every school will recognize the Father Willie of the last pages. There is no propaganda or preaching ; the writer knows his craft too well for that, though it may be suspected that he will provide more than a *divertissement* for many readers.

## ATHENS : OCTOBER, 1944

### I. THE LANDING

**I**T was about eleven o'clock on Sunday morning, the Fifteenth, when we first sailed into sight of Salamis, having the island of Aegina on our port bow and Cape Sounion farther away to star-board. At first it was impossible to tell where the island of Salamis ended and the mainland of Attica began. Then a Greek sailor, with parted lips and shining eyes, after three-and-a-half years' exile, pointed out the places with their names.

Straight ahead, that litter of chimneys and cupolas just discernible on the sea-front, that was the Piraeus, his home. East of it, facing Salamis : the Bay of Phaleron. And the "violet wreath" of mountains that filled the rest of the horizon? That, behind Piraeus, was the hill of Daphne, part of Mount Aegaleos. Above and beyond Aegaleos, in the distance, was the shape of Parnis. Eastward of Parnis, hardly visible, was the point of Mount Pentelicon. And this great mass sweeping back from the Bay of Phaleron, this is Imettos—Mount Hymettus. I could not ask, "And where is Athens?" Somewhere in the narrow plain that reaches back from the sea to the Pass joining Parnis and Pentelicon, somewhere in the middle distance between Aegaleos and Hymettus, it must be : the gleaming diadem in this purple crown. And then, on a ridge that seemed a spur of Mount Hymettus, tiny but distinct in the individuation of its columns I saw it : the Parthenon, the ravished but unconquerable Maid.

It was one of those moments, one of the rarest of them. But it was necessarily only a moment. The air was full of flashing signals. The sea rocked with spasmodic explosions. A Heinkel swooped out of nowhere on a daring reconnaissance over our landing-craft before her guns could fire, and made off, chased by two Spitfires from Araxos. (They got it.) A tanker blew up alongside of us. After a little we turned and put back to the isle of Poros, while the minesweepers got on with their work. The islanders came swarming out in their little boats, shouting, "Io, Patriotes, Patriotes!" and our crew—of the Royal Hellenic Navy—ripped open cases of rations and flung tins and cartons overboard. One or two of the R.A.F. officers said, "There go our rations for the week"; but the men said, "Let the poor —s have them"; and threw down cigarettes as well.

That evening the Captain invited us to the wardroom to drink a toast to Hellas Freed. He was an Athenian who had sailed his destroyer into Alexandria after the German occupation; he had been given this ship, the L.C.T. Samos, in America, and had taken her three times to and from the beaches of Salerno during the landings

there ; he was waiting to see his wife and family after four years of war, tyranny, and famine. Until to-day, we—I mean the rank-and-file—had not been certain which flag would be flying from the Acropolis : the Swastika or the Blue Cross of Greece—or perhaps the Hammer-and-Sickle.

On the previous Tuesday evening at Taranto, we had been told that our object was to occupy and service the big airfield near Athens, so as (a) to "chase out what Germans remained" and impede their junction with the divisions to the North, and (b) to organize an air-service of food and supplies to the Greeks, and keep order if necessary. There were already two small British Forces in Greece, Western and Southern. One, under Colonel Jellicoe, had taken Patras and Missolonghi and was co-operating with Colonel Zervas, leader of the E.D.E.S. guerilla in Epirus ; while the original force that had landed at Cythera, was making its way up the road from Sparta against little opposition. The Germans were pulling all their troops in the Peloponnese back upon Athens. But with the Russian Army sweeping round the Carpathians, it was certain they would not remain there long. Only in Crete would they stay—because they had to, "self-supporting prisoners-of-war."

Early on Wednesday morning we had embarked on the L.C.T. Samos which was taking the men and equipment necessary for setting up the airfield. I had joined the Unit only two days before, after a week of hasty hops in search of it, so was lucky to be included. There was another L.C.T. with us taking men and equipment for the Piraeus docks, and some corvettes and other subsidiary craft. That evening we moved from the Mare Piccolo to the Mare Grande where the hulks sunk by Esmonde and his Swordfish still lay. But it was not till six on the following evening that the great harbour gates yawned open, and we put to sea, sailing south-south-east by south at a slow six knots an hour. We were rather crowded, six and kit, in a cabin eight foot square, but in those conditions one makes friends easily.

On that same day, Thursday, October the twelfth, the Germans began to pull out of Athens.

By six o'clock on Friday morning we were heading due East at ten knots. And on that Friday, the last German officer took the Swastika down from the Parthenon. The tramp of feet and the grinding of armoured vehicles had hardly died away, when the Athenians, crouched in their barred and shuttered houses, felt gusts of bullets sweep the streets and spatter against the walls. The *Khi-ites* (members of Khi, 'X,' the ultra-monarchist guerilla band) were having it out with the K.K.E. (the Communist Party, known as the *Ku-ku-ethes*), for the control of Athens. Some dark deeds were done on that day, and corpses were found afterwards in wells and sewers which were only indirectly victims of the Axis.

By Saturday morning we had passed between Crete and Cythera,

and turned north. There we sighted the main convoy from Alexandria, and joined up with them: troopships, minesweepers, destroyers, and four cruisers—the *Orion*, the *Ajax*, and two others I have forgotten. A severe gale blew up, and the landing-craft wallowed, as these things do, from side to side disturbingly; I wondered if I were not over-optimistic in announcing the time and place of Mass on the morrow; the place was the only space available, the back of a three-ton lorry. But it was exciting to think that we were going to beach instead of docking. I suppose the Crusaders were the last people to beach their armour in Greece. For from the Middle Ages till to-day when the Americans have produced these landing-craft, beaching-in-force has been a lost art.

Against this same vicious wind on Saturday, the men of the 2nd Independent Paratroop Brigade flew from Italy and dropped on the airfield at Megara, half-way between Corinth and Athens. Their chaplain, Father Fenelon, dropped with them. The ground-wind caused some casualties. One man, bumping over the surface and momentarily losing consciousness, awoke to find a Greek woman embracing him and offering him wine. The paratroopers joined up with the British force that had worked its way up from the Peloponnese, and both advanced on the capital. Unforgotten at this juncture should be a party of marines who landed at Marathon, and saved the Dam, the city's sole source of water.

But before our troops reached Eleusis, and long before the hulls of our convoy had appeared above the horizon, a mysterious telepathy ran through the silent houses of Athens. Windows were flung open, heads popped out and shouted across the streets: "The English have come!" So many times the rumour had started; after the victory of Alamein, after the surrender of Italy, and after each one—another winter to face; so many times, so many wounds. But this time the rumour swelled and would not be suppressed. Then everyone from windows and rooftops saw or heard of the Blue Flag hoisted on the Acropolis. The *Khi-ites* and the *Ku-ku-ethes* paused in their noisy debate, pocketed their weapons, and were swept, with mixed feelings presumably, into the great massing concourse of the people, who sang and cried and danced—the taut, Greek, graceful dances—down the streets.

On Sunday morning, the grinning Red Devils appeared, and disappeared, under waves of tumultuous enthusiasm; British and Hellenic warships hove to, in sight of the Acropolis; British aircraft roared and dipped in salute; and all the church bells rang.

It was a nicely-timed political stroke on our part.

So that when, next morning, we finally beached our craft on the edge of the airfield Kalamaki-Hassani, three miles down the coast from Phaleron, there were some casualties through mines, but there was no opposition. Perhaps it was just as well. But on the other



hand, perhaps it was a pity. I mean : if there had been blood shed then in unison by Greeks and British, it might have saved a later and less noble bloodshed against each other.

## 2. THE AIRFIELD

Kalamaki, later re-named Hassani, was the loveliest airfield I have ever been on. I speak only, of course, from the aesthetic point of view ; it was some time before tyres ceased to burst on hidden obstacles in the runway.

Kalamaki is a small plain in a concave arc of the Hymettus chain. If you came in from the south where the royal-blue sea washed the strange-shaped rocks of Vouliagmeni (the Sunken Headland), you hit the runway only a few yards from the water's edge, and then ran in at an angle of about forty-five to the coast-line. The north end of the runway was a gap between the foothills of Hymettus, through which you could get a more intimate and exciting view of Athens than from the coast. The green foothills hid the rather ugly suburbs that have grown up to house the immigrants from Asia Minor, and caught only the Acropolis and Lycavittos in the cleft of the Attic Plain, so that you saw them framed and isolated in the foreground, and framed again in the background by Parnis and Pentelicon.

But the chief source of beauty was the indescribable one of light ; not only the "innumerable laughter" of Phaleron Bay, and the exotic rose-gold sunsets that bathed the misty hills of Corinth, but the ordinary everyday light that flitted about Hymettus. It was a curious silver-purple garment, silver in the shine, purple in the shadows. I think—though I am probably wrong—that it is a reflection of the wild thyme that covers the rocks as heather does the hills in Scotland ; the grey-green masses have dark-brown stalks and innumerable tiny, little glistening spikes.

But there was not much time to appreciate these points in the first few days. One's first impression was of desolation. Of the hundreds of clusters around the aerodrome of once-pretty little villas, each with its own well and windmill, where Athenians rich and poor alike would flock for the summer months, every house had been wrecked or ruined—a little by our bombing, the most part by the retreating Germans. Perhaps the destruction here did not go beyond what was necessary to impede, or at least incommode, our troops—though at a disproportionate cost. But later evidence was to reveal destruction on a much larger and quite inexcusable scale. I have seen village after village where every single house had been gutted and smashed, and where the inhabitants had spent one winter, and would spend another, in holes underneath the ruins.

The Germans left a double record in Greece. Their behaviour, in contrast to that of the Bulgarians and of—to a lesser extent—the Italians, seems on the whole to have been correct and aloof ; unofficial

acts of individual savagery were probably outnumbered by unofficial acts of individual kindness ; (there were many Austrians in Athens). But their policy, as distinct from their behaviour, was one of horrifying cruelty, comparable with that of the Bolsheviks in the Ukraine in 1932-3. Not so much by blood and fire—though that was bad enough—but by a deliberate withholding or dispersal of the bare means of existence, they compensated themselves for their inability to win the people's allegiance. If the Greeks had really collaborated, they would have been fed. They resisted and they starved. Unlike some other (perhaps wiser) nations, they remained our Ally to the point of seeing their country ruined worse than any other country—except Poland our first Ally. In this the Nazis were logical : they punished the most cruelly those who stood by us the most stubbornly. But *we* present the strange spectacle of utter detestation of Nazi principles coupled with a bland acquiescence in their practice. This, at least, in the case of Poland. In the case of Greece, happily, we look like taking a firmer stand and refusing to be dyed *double* in treachery to our first friends.

But to return to the airfield : it was in a mess. And it had to be made serviceable at once for very considerable traffic. By next day, Tuesday, the squadrons of Spit-bombers were coming in ; and sorties against the Germans in Thessaly started at once. Almost immediately there were casualties, and the first funeral. It sticks in my mind because I knew the pilot well, and because of an incident that happened afterwards. Some Greek women had surrounded the funeral party, and brought flowers from their own relatives' graves to lay on the British remains. As the party filed off after the burial service, I was the last to leave, and noticed that a Greek officer, representing the Hellenic Air Force, had remained behind. Suddenly he saluted and cried *Zito o Athanatos Iros* . "Long Live the Immortal Hero." And the people all cried in answer, *Zito*. Apparently it was their normal ceremony, but it was, coming on top of everything, nearly too much for me.

The Greeks, so backward in routine efficiency, have an epic strain in the face of death and wounds. They become electrified and challenge high heaven in no uncertain manner. I have seen an ordinary woman when a man was shot down in the street beside her, stand like some Sibyl or Cassandra, with blazing eyes, one hand pointing at the corpse and the other raised to heaven. A lieutenant of the Hellenic Navy during a convoy battle in the Mediterranean, had one hand all but severed ; he tore off the remainder and flung it in the sea, saying, "I give this for Greece." Fantastic, but sincere. David Walker recounts how in '41 on the Albanian Front, a wounded Evzone who had lost his feet through frost-bite, struggled to rise when he saw him, saying, "Let me salute an English soldier before I die." Also, I have noticed on more than one occasion when there have been fatalities,

and when I myself was fussing around in a rather shaken manner, how some Greek man-in-the-street would take charge with a verve and incision utterly unlike their usual attitude of haphazard and ambiguity. In this, and in some other ways, they reminded me often of the Spaniards.

### 3. FIRST DAYS

Afterwards, I went into Athens with a friend. After Phaleron, the road divides, one fork continuing round the coast to the Piraeus, the other turning inland and running dead-straight for three-and-a-half miles into the City. This avenue is the Leophoros Singrou; it is very broad and flanked all the way by trees. It is the most exciting street, for various reasons, that I have been in; at one end of the miles is the sight of the sea and Salamis; the other extremity is filled with two great columns of Hadrian's Temple, standing up clear and graceful in the sky. We were on the back of an open lorry, filled with an assortment of marines, paratroopers and airmen. The side-walks were thronged all the way with people, and everyone waved and shouted greetings. Everywhere flew the flags of Greece, Great Britain and America. On some warehouses, ruined by our bombs, there were Union Jacks and the inscription "Long Live the R.A.F." There was only one slightly jarring note, a hastily constructed arch with a small Union Jack impaled on an enormous Hammer-and-Sickle, under which we had to pass. This was the famous K.K.E. arch, later to be burnt down and rebuilt by the rival factions, I have forgotten how many times.

My intention had been to visit the Catholic Archbishop, and discover what army R.C. Chaplains had arrived. But once dismounted from the truck, it was impossible to move in any deliberate direction. The streets were dense, and it was still only the third day after the "liberation." We were plucked at on all sides, and bidden to come in and drink a toast. Sometimes it was impossible to resist; but fortunately they were only thimblefuls; the Greeks are very abstemious; also, though their effusiveness is often annoying, it is hardly ever impolite. The only thing was to cease feeling ridiculous, and enjoy it. My friend, who was from Kerry, kept shouting to me, "I'm telling ye, Father, these people are *Irish*, they're Irish." He could not speak a word of Greek, but was conducting an animated and apparently satisfying conversation with an old man who could not speak a word of anything but Greek.

I have forgotten all the people we met on that day, or whether (as my friend would say) it was on that day that we met them. There was a party of workmen in the quarter beneath the Acropolis; there, we drank 'retsina'—that wine which is like metaphysical poetry, abstruse, masculine, rare—and talked about the Germans. *Ghermani, Boom-Boom!* was the refrain. They claimed to have saved the Electric

Plant of the City from destruction by the Germans ; later, they were to strike, plunging the city in darkness, because they said the Government had failed to acknowledge this service. Even at this early stage they tried to draw us on the political situation. They appeared to be E.A.M.-ites—except for one, the nicest, who had been decorated on the Albanian Front ; but all were pro-British.

Then, there was a family of four generations, ranging from two to seventy. Here, there were tears as well as 'retsina' ; and an old lady kept calling on the 'Panaghia' to bless us, as a sort of litanic refrain to the usual discussion. (I have never seen the inside of a Greek house, except some very rich cosmopolites', that had not the Icons of Christ, the Pankrator, Mary the Panaghia, and some patron saint or angel.) Here also we talked about the Germans and touched lightly on the political situation ; they were Venizelist Liberals. During an argument between an uncle and nephew, a daughter of the house said something to me which I remembered later. *Na sas po, kati ti. Oli Ellines ligho trelì.* "I must warn you about something. All Greeks are a little mad."

Finally there was a colonel who produced, oh dear, of all things, a bottle of John Haig. He said he had kept it hidden in the ground for three-and-a-half-years, to drink with the British on the day of their victorious return. So—we talked about the Germans and touched lightly on the political situation. The Colonel was a monarchist and supporter of E.D.E.S., and looked to the British to take a strong line in this matter. My friend, who is a Republican, kept nodding gravely ; but I infer it to have been the gravity of stupor rather than of acquiescence.

After all this, I decided to postpone visiting the Archbishop, and we escaped back, in the falling night, to Kalamaki. The Acropolis was floodlit splendiferously, from the Plant which the Germans had failed to destroy. But natural light suits it better.

Next Sunday afternoon, when things were calmer, I visited the Acropolis, escorted by a young Athenian doctor, a convert of our Fathers whom I had just met. There were many Greek families out, mingling with our troops and showing them round. Freedom was alive and laughing in the air. I became fully aware for the first time of the extraordinary quality of the Athenian atmosphere, about which so much has been written ; "golden" and "chrysal" are the two words that at once, inadequately, suggest themselves. One feels the Light as a presiding genius independent of the sunshine, one sees it almost in the act of bestowing shape and colour from some mysterious other-world, on things that by themselves are blurred and lifeless. Here is the arch and original shrine and tarrying-place of Beauty.

It was the hour that corresponds to the "Ave Maria" in Rome, and the many church bells began to ring gently. In Aleppo once, I had felt the force of Saint Paul announcing the fulfilment of the vision



glimpsed by Abraham. Here, looking down on the wrinkled Areopagus, I remembered Saint Paul once more but with a more poignant melancholy, how he announced the fulfilment of the vision that was glimpsed by Plato : *ἐξαίφνης κατόψεται τι τὸ καλόν*, of a sudden one sees it, something, the Beautiful. They would not listen to him then, but they learnt later.

But still the vision trembles on a thread of slender and too fine-spun texture. Soon the golden calm will shatter ; gunshots will howl-like dreary demoniac laughter round and round and round the violet bowl of hills. Soon the golden light will fall on the division of flesh and blood, dried blood and grey flesh and piled-up garbage in the blocked and tumbled side streets. Sooner than write of that, I will stop and say instead : " Good-bye Hellas. May God guide you and save you and restore to you at last, the joy that is yours by nature and the freedom by desert ! "

CHRISTOPHER DEVLIN.

---

---

### *What shall I bring you*

What shall I bring you for an Easter gift  
This April morning when the wind rides high  
Driving the waves and the hissing spindrift,  
Urging cloud-chariots across the sky ?

What shall I bring you as a morning gift :  
The first twin lambs born on the lonely farm,  
White as anemones or mountain snowdrift,  
Warm in the cradle of the shepherd's arm ?

What shall I bring you as a worthy gift :  
The speckled salmon running in from sea,  
Jewelled as he leaps the falls, and swift  
To seek the stream-head in spring-ecstasy ?

What shall I bring you in this raingreen dawn :  
The thousand daffodils of Kerrisdale,  
Swaying in glory on the cottage lawn,  
Nourished by rivers in the pallid vale ?

What shall I bring you as a fitting gift :  
Down from the breast of the croodling rockdove  
That builds her nest among the pink sea-thrift,  
Hid from the falcon in the sky above ?

Nothing in tribute could I bring to you  
That would suffice to tell how you are fair,  
Though in your gentle path I could bestrew  
All nature's gifts from sea and earth and air.

A. C. JENKINS

## THE PRIESTS OF DACHAU

EDITORIAL NOTE.—The following article contains an account of the life of the more than 2,000 Catholic priests, imprisoned in the notorious concentration camp of Dachau. It tells not only of their privations and ill-treatment but also of their ingenuity and courage in ministering to the spiritual needs of one another and of lay Catholic prisoners. The article first appeared, in French, in the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* (September-October, 1945), and its author, Father de Coninck, Superior of the Jesuit residence in Brussels, was confined in Dachau for three years. By kindness of the editors of N.R.T., this English version has been made by the Rev. James Wallace, of Heythrop College.

**I**N December, 1941, I was sentenced to six months' imprisonment by the Brussels Military Tribunal for giving conferences during Clergy Retreats on the subject of Nazism: the reasons for its seductive influence over so many people, the basic incompatibility of its doctrine with the Gospel, and the best means of combating it.

In May, 1942, without further trial, I was deported to Germany—to concentration-camp. These gentlemen were convinced, so they told me, that I was the soul of the resistance of the clergy. This was a great exaggeration, but I accepted the honour paid to me, and its consequences. I left for Dachau, where I was to spend three years: three years of experiences which I would not have missed for anything in the world, which I am going to describe because I cannot believe that this favour of Providence was intended for my benefit alone. . . .

When I arrived at Dachau on June 18th, 1942, there were some 2,500 priests there; when I left it on May 13th, 1945, there were 1,100. Some 60 Germans had been released during the last weeks; the 1,300 others had died in the camp, and their deaths cannot be attributed to natural causes.

All nations were represented. Towards the end (if I remember rightly) the French numbered 123, the Czechs 80, and the Belgians 33. The Poles had always constituted the majority. I already knew and respected the saintly auxiliary Bishop of Woztslavek, Mgr. Kozal, who died from exhaustion in December, 1942. This body of priests was truly European: 138 dioceses and (I think) 25 religious congregations were represented. (A priest from Metz kept records for our block which were deposited with the Parish-Priest of Dachau.) The Society of Jesus formed a notable group of nearly 100: 63 of them were still alive at the liberation. They came from 13 different provinces of the Order: Holland, the two<sup>1</sup> German and the two Polish provinces, the province of the Oriental Rite, the Czech, Austrian, Belgian and the four French provinces. We had a complete ecclesiastical hierarchy,

<sup>1</sup> There were, and still are, three German provinces. (Translator.)

from a bishop (the Bishop of Clermont-Ferrand) down to *petits séminaristes*, and all the Christian denominations : Catholics, Orthodox, Protestants, Old-Catholics and Polish Mariavites.

At the beginning of 1941 all priest-prisoners had been gathered together at Dachau and assigned to three blocks : No. 26 (reserved at first for Germans ; later the non-Polish were added) and Nos. 28 and 30.

By arrangement with the Holy See, this concentration was accompanied by various privileges : permission to live together as an ecclesiastical community and to hold religious services, exemption from heavy labour and work in war-factories, and some extra food paid for by the German Episcopate. The S.S. saw in this last a pretext for calumniating us as lazy gluttons and an opportunity for making game of us. For example, every day we were given a cup of wine, to be drunk when the order was given by the S.S. and then turned upside down by their order, whether the cup was empty or still full ! Our privileges, however, were soon reduced to living together, the use of a chapel, and exemption from transfer to other camps.

The three blocks were later reduced to two, and in the final months to one. The overcrowding was then unbelievable. In my room with a floor-space of 170 square yards, there were 350 of us !

During the time when ecclesiastics were exempt from heavy labour they were nevertheless exploited in every way. In winter the terrible job of removing snow from the camp was imposed upon them. All day long we were out shifting the snow, piling it on upturned tables on long wagons and tipping it into a river at the edge of the camp. The work besides being hard and exhausting, was made more intolerable by being placed under the charge of *capos*—poor, degenerate brutes, worse than the S.S. and the cause of the death of many unfortunate people.

Twice a day we had to go to the kitchen for the heavy cauldrons used for our food : they weighed 180 lbs. each. An equal weight of soup (so-called !) was poured in, and two of us, shod in wretched sandals we could hardly keep on our feet, had to carry them to all the blocks. This was seldom accomplished without one or other of the carriers stumbling, amid the hostile jeers of the spectators who seemed to be consumed with a bestial hatred for *Pfaffen* (i.e., the priests). Our block would then have to replace the spilt soup with its own.

It was not long before our exemption from heavy work ceased to count for anything and most of the priests were formed into gangs to work in what was called the 'plantation.' Medicinal plants and expensive flowers were grown there ; it was the property of the big-hats of the Party, and from it they are said to have made an average yearly profit of 750,000 marks. It claimed a frightening number of victims, including most of the priests who died at Dachau. To walk there was exhausting enough in their famished condition, and they

had to work like slaves from dawn to dusk. They might return soaking and muddy, but there was no way of drying their thin working clothes—they had to put them on again, wet, the next day. Here again the work, arduous in itself, was rendered inhuman by *capos* and *sous-capos* and S.S. guards with horribly savage dogs.

Besides the plantation, there was land-clearance to which other gangs were assigned. I was in one of these. I have seen unhappy men die in the fields, worn out by privation and maltreatment. And could I ever forget that poor priest lying in tortured agony on a pile of hay while a young S.S. amused himself by setting his dog on him?

Nevertheless as time went on, the regime became less harsh and priests were given lighter work as well. Thus it was that about 100 of them were taken into the pay-department of the S.S., where conditions were more humane. The S.S. in the office were for the most part of the sort we called *embusqués*; nearly all of them appeared to be educated men of the professional type, and their behaviour contrasted strikingly with the coarseness and cruelty of the ordinary S.S. Thirty priests were also sent to the infirmary to look after wards (in effect they practically acted as doctors), or to assist the hospital-secretary.

But this good luck did not last. One day a well-documented report on the whole history of Dachau, written by one of us, was discovered. It was a neat exposition of their methods of repression. The result was our removal from all positions which would give us information about what was going on in the camp. However, we regained the lost ground little by little: "Drive out nature and it comes back at a gallop"—drive out the Church and it comes back step by step!

As a result, at the end, we were almost the only prisoners employed in the "registration office." This enabled us to learn beforehand of new arrivals—those terrible processions to Dachau from other camps that were being evacuated towards the end of the war. We could give a friendly welcome to the unhappy victims of those death-marches. I had the joy of comforting in this way the founders of the J.O.C.,<sup>1</sup> Fernand Tonnet and Paul Garcet.

Toil was not the only thing that brought so many priests to their end; there was also ill-usage inflicted by torturers. Never before Dachau had I seen real hatred: eyes aflame with wickedness, mouths twisted in anger at the mere sight of a priest. To strike, wound, or even kill a priest seemed, with some of these men, a necessity of instinct.

The head of Block 28 was a former S.A. man. He had been imprisoned for some offence unknown to us. I do not remember a single day on which this man did not become enraged with sadistic violence against one or other of us. The Dutch Carmelite, Fr. Brandsma, a professor of the University of Nymwegen, survived only

<sup>1</sup> *Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne.*



two months under the beatings this brute inflicted on him at every opportunity. He died happy to have been treated like Christ scourged.

And here I shall record a terrible scene described to me some weeks before our liberation by the hero of the incident, a young Tyrolese priest, Fr. Rieser. One day, an S.S. man ordered him to twist some rusty barbed-wire into a crown. He then clamped it on his head, and calling some Jews working near by made them re-enact the scene of the Crowning with Thorns: they had to dance round the priest, leer at him, strike him, insult him, spit on him. When this pleasure palled, he made his victim, still wearing his horrible crown, spend the rest of the day loading heavy barrows and wheeling them to the other end of the camp.

This recalls another ignoble parody in which some sick priests were forced to take part one Good Friday. They were made to climb to the top of some cupboards and then intone the well-known chorale: "O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden."

Besides these occasional brutalities, horrifying experiments were carried out in the infirmary. Hundreds of Poles fell victim to them: sometimes they were inoculated with malaria, sometimes with tumours,<sup>1</sup> and then various treatments and remedies were tried out. I cannot remember without emotion a young Jesuit, a third-year theologian, who died after a month of atrocious suffering with his leg completely gangrenous; he received no treatment—he served as a standard of comparison for the gangrene cases they *were* treating.

It is not my intention to describe in detail all the horrors of Dachau; they were as bad as anything one can imagine, and they made the place a hell. But there were splendours as well as horrors, and their memory is more worthy of preservation: they are convincing evidence that God always has the last word.

Our chapel was in Block 26. It was strictly reserved for that block and the S.S. forbade entry to all others. But our daring grew steadily and so effectively that finally anyone who wished came to the chapel. There were times when policing policy hampered us, and hindered somewhat our access to the chapel. But the success of Nazi ukases was—like that of all ukases—ephemeral.

The chapel was nothing more than a prisoners' room with the partition between eating and sleeping quarters removed. It was conceded in 1941. The altar was a small table, the top of which was about a square yard in area. Our 'Church-Treasure' consisted of a portable Mass-kit. The use of the chapel had to be shared by the different denominations, and this was arranged with notable charity on the part of all concerned.

The sanctuary was furnished little by little, with or without the consent of our jailers. Thus, by the end, the altar was a most worthy one, thanks entirely to ingenious work by the prisoners. A tabernacle

<sup>1</sup> "phlegmons."

was made out of the camp furniture (needless to say, without permission), and decorated with ornaments first of tin, from food-tins, and then of brass, "recovered from the enemy." The main cross over the altar was a simple sculpture made in the camp. It was later replaced by a magnificent work of art presented to us by the Munster Catholic Action Organisation, and became our processional cross. The candlesticks also were our own work and in very good taste. For exposition of the Blessed Sacrament (we even had perpetual Adoration), we had two monstrances at our disposal: one of them was severe in style and symbolic—a black cross with the ostensorium (tin) in the form of the sun sending out rays; the other was made of light lemon wood.

We were also sent a beautiful statue of Our Lady. It became the object of continual devotion—how many poor souls came to its feet for comfort! When the Dachau Basilica of Reparation has been built (the American authorities have already conceded the site of the camp administrative offices for this purpose), pilgrims will find this statue in a place of special honour therein.

The walls of the chapel were soon adorned with the Stations of the Cross, and devotion to the Sacred Heart and St. Joseph was evidenced by a bas-relief and some well-framed engravings. A small table on the epistle side served as a sacristy. Gradually we acquired all that was necessary for the celebration of the Church's solemn offices, thanks largely to gifts made by the faithful in sympathy with their persecuted priests. At Easter, 1944, we had no less than four large Paschal candles. Wine and hosts in abundance were procured with help of the Parish Priest of Dachau, with whom we were allowed to communicate on the 25th of each month for our liturgical needs. A hundred four-part breviaries were presented by the Episcopal Curia of Breslau. They were in constant use during 1944, when we were largely kept inactive and had time for more priestly occupations. In 1945 the block became so overcrowded (1,100 inhabitants) that the recitation of the Office was possible only for comparatively few of us.

Our services in the chapel developed step by step with the improvement of the sanctuary. We began with shortened low Masses, starting at the Offertory and ending at the Communion, but we reached the level of Pontifical ceremonies with a Bishop and a Benedictine Abbot. The Liturgy at Dachau would make a notable chapter of history—too notable for me to attempt to write it. It is clear that the clergy have not yet gone the whole way in the understanding of the Liturgy (or more precisely, the laws which govern the Liturgy) but it will be sufficient for me to describe the events of our Liturgical life.

We had Mass each day before the official rising-time. Four priests helped to distribute Holy Communion, going along the ranks of those present. At first, by the order of the camp-commandant, it was always the same priest who said Mass. Why? Well, whoever has lived under

the Nazis will know that for them restrictions are an end in themselves : vain to look for other motives, there are none. However, from Christmas 1942 onwards, restrictions diminished in number. For special reasons a substitute was allowed to take the place of the fixed celebrant. Thus, for example, I was called upon to say a Requiem Mass for Very Rev. Fr. Ledóchowski. Applying our constantly practised snowball technique, we soon had two Masses on Sundays, and by the end, through steady additions, we had Mass almost continuously from morning to evening.

On Sundays we used to have High Mass, preceded by a sermon, and Solemn Vespers. The sermon was always in German until I broke the spell with Latin, which had a better claim to be the language of our gathering of the nations. Later on we organised services for the different countries in which they could use their own languages and enjoy the comforting experience of a bit of national life. Large numbers of laymen attended the services.

The typhus epidemic in 1943 gave a blow to the Draconian discipline of the camp from which it never recovered. At the same time compulsory labour stopped. We had a chance to develop the spiritual life of the camp and we did not fail to use it.

In the first place, we had leisure for preparation in the liturgical sphere. Our musicians—and we had some eminent ones—produced compositions of their own, including a polyphonic “Dachau Mass,” in which the congregation has its part as in a Gregorian Mass. I sincerely hope that my great friend, Dom Grégoire Schwack, O.S.B., will publish this Mass : the sacred art of Church Music would greatly benefit thereby. The great feasts, such as Christmas, Holy Week and Corpus Christi, were kept with full splendour. The peak was reached in the pontifical ceremonies ; we had everything we needed : purple cassock, mozetta, tunics, two mitres, crozier, pectoral cross and ring. It was all made in the camp. The materials were ingeniously “organised.” Not in vain had we studied the doctrine of “occult compensation” !

The Liturgy was far from exhausting our initiative. In May, I conducted twice a week, an “Ignatian Contemplation” on a mystery of the Rosary : a mixture of mental and vocal prayer (the decade of Hail Mary’s), occupying about half-an-hour. In addition to the ordinary Stations of the Cross, we had, in Lent, a musical contemplation on the Way of the Cross, in which meditation (and our life provided plenty of matter for application) alternated with the classic traditional motets. At Christmas 1944, we organized a “Homage of the Nations” to the King born in the stable. National groups sang their traditional carols, which were chosen so as to expound the whole mystery. I introduced and linked up the different contributions, so that the hymns became the natural expression of the sentiments of all present. We came away determined to start similar activities in

our future fields of work. In fact, we kept this positive and practical end before our eyes in all our organization of the religious life of the camp. We had a Mission Sunday, a Pope's Day and a "Closing of the Year"—an original venture, this last, in three parts: a commemoration of those who had died during the year, reparation for sins committed, and thanksgiving for benefits received. Sacerdotal Jubilees were celebrated frequently and with great feeling. But the crown of all was the Ordination to the Priesthood of a deacon from Munster, a prisoner of 5 years' standing. The ceremony was performed with full canonical rigour and was a triumph of clandestinity. Dimissorial letters from Munster, faculties from Munich (whence also came the Ordinal and the Oil of the Catechumens)—everything was in order, and "they" were completely in the dark. That Gaudete Sunday, 1944, will be ever green in our memory. Was there *ever* a more impressive Ordination—in prison, with hundreds of priests imposing their hands on yet another "Vinctus Christi"? It was magnificent. The introit fitted the occasion to perfection: "Gaudete, iterum dico vobis, gaudete." To complete the story, let me add that the Protestant pastors attended en masse, and took upon themselves the preparation of a dinner for the new priest that far surpassed our normal modest fare.

In addition to services there was an interesting development of theological activity. The camp rules strictly forbade any religious proselytism, and theological discussions and conferences fell under this ban. To the more than narrow minds of our jailers any meeting could be only for the purpose of 'talking politics.' But that did not stop us,—it was merely necessary to be prudent.

When I arrived at Dachau, I was put into a group of from four to five hundred condemned to the gas-chamber. Thanks to a combination of circumstances, in which the protection of Our Lady was manifest, I was able to avoid death, but for two months I shared the life of these *morituri*. As a new arrival, I was practically the only healthy member of the group, and this clearly put me under an obligation to do all in my power to help the others, among whom was a high proportion of Polish priests as well as, for example, the Abbé Maurice de Backer, a parish-priest from Rhode-Saint-Genève, the Abbé Esch, editor of the *Luxemburger Wort*, and Mgr. Origer, a deputy of the Grand Duchy. Very soon I was able to procure the Blessed Sacrament—(all religious acts were strictly forbidden outside the chapel)—and I broke it into small fragments (twenty to a host), which I wrapped up in cigarette papers. Thanks to this Divine Reserve which I carried on me night and day, I was able to distribute the Sacrament, *robur et auxilium*, and even on many occasions to give Viaticum to those on their way to execution.

I also secretly organized an eight-day Retreat, with three exercises a day given in Latin. Each exercise was given in a different place



while we stood or sat together. We had a daily Ciborium Benediction, with my spectacles case as the Ciborium and my knee as the Throne on which we placed our Treasure. That too is unforgettable. Later on, in the infirmary, I arranged another Retreat, for the sick priests. Those who could walk about came and sat on the bed of our dear Polish colleague Grabowski, and then returned to their wards and repeated the meditation points to those confined to bed.

In the block we had, from January, 1943 onwards, a series of conferences which I gave in one of the rooms at 8 a.m. We had some amusing adventures: the subject would have to be abruptly changed when the "enemy," as sometimes happened, popped in before our guard, caught unawares, could signal to us. I repeated in these conferences the course of Pastoral Theology I used to give at Louvain. It was an excellent exercise for myself—I had not a note to help me, only my memory—and the effort I had to make was of the greatest benefit to me.

There were conferences in the chapel as well. One of the subjects was the position of the Church in different countries. These conferences gave us experimental proof of the necessity of ensuring that all future priests be informed about the vitality of the One Holy Church throughout Christianity. Again, every evening in the sleeping-quarters there was a short talk which could serve as preparation for meditation, and which also led to fruitful conversations during working hours. The lay prisoners benefited indirectly.

We came to the conclusion that we ought to petition for the appointment of an ecclesiastical superior in the camp. Oddly enough no one had thought of it before, but the necessity of a head grew evident. The Bishop of Munster accepted our reasons and nominated one of us Dean (Doyen).

The Jesuits, as I said above, still numbered 63 during the last months of the camp's existence. To us too it seemed necessary to have a bond of authority and someone responsible for the conservation of the Society's ideals. We received the appointment of a superior by secret channels, and thenceforward led a true community life. Each month we had a full reunion: our spirit was fortified by an exhortation from the Spiritual Father (Fr. Pies) and an address from the Superior, and then we all assisted at Mass celebrated by one of us. We had regular Renovations of Vows, preceded by the customary Triduum. I cannot forget the edification experienced as a result of the simplicity with which all had recourse to the Superior, just as if we were in a house of the Order.

Other Orders and Congregations did likewise. We were all happy to be able to tighten thus the bonds uniting us among ourselves and with those from whom we were separated by our prison exile.

I must add that exclusively spiritual activities are not the whole story. Charity relieved our material needs, as I can testify from my own experience. I cannot, for example, pass over in silence the

magnificent effort made by our German Jesuit provinces for the 50 or so Jesuits cut off by the successful advance of the Allies from food supplies from their own countries.

In conclusion, I must say a few words on the apostolate among the lay prisoners. During the final year, there was much more liberty and we could do things formerly quite impossible.

It would be fascinating to make a study of the religious mentality of prisoners. Outside, sometimes, people have an idyllic, romantic and false idea of it. They readily imagine these thousands of men, bereft of all human aid and under constant threat of death, turning impetuously towards God ; priests having merely to make themselves known and say a word for the faithful to fall on their knees like ripe fruit from a shaken tree. There would be a thing or two to say about these conversions *in quacumque necessitate*.

Nevertheless great good was accomplished. Above all, people of different and often opposing beliefs made contact and learned to respect each other. That in itself was valuable. A Protestant pastor told me that he was very happy to have been able to live with Catholic priests—he had seen how false were so many of the things said about them.

There *were* conversions, and some very beautiful ones. But I believe that the greatest good will be the result of our numerous, intimate and enlightening contacts. Many strangers to the Church have come to know it through the priests who were their comrades—through their joyously valiant and devoted lives, more than by controversy and discussion.

(I shall develop these observations in my second article.)

When we organized the distribution of Holy Communion, it was essential to have the assistance of 'lay-deacons': modern editions of St. Tertius who fulfilled this office most willingly.

We were provided with a fine opportunity for apostolic work among the sick during the 1945 epidemic. The devotedness of the priests was equal to the occasion—some even let themselves be shut up with the typhus cases who were sealed off from the rest of the camp. Some of these priests died, victims of charity ; but their stay in the infected blocks was a true Pentecost: hardly any Catholics refused the Sacraments—on the contrary they begged for them and died most saintly deaths.

There are many more things one could say about our life as priests in prison and slavery, but what I have said is sufficient to show its general features. God allowed hundreds of priests to live in chains, hundreds of priests to die. But imprisonment and death were not the end—were not annihilation. They were a sacrifice which, in virtue of the Divine Sacrifice, was redemptive and sanctifying ; a sacrifice to which, as to the Divine Sacrifice, we may apply the words of the Psalmist : *Qui seminant in lacrimis, in exultatione metent*.

I shall speak about the harvest—a rich one—in my next article.

L. DE CONINCK.

*Translated from the French by James Wallace.*

## BLOTTING-PAPER THERAPY

THE expression is of a one-time medical lecturer, inspired, perhaps, by Ambroise Paré's creed : " I treated him, God cured him." He had little sympathy with the prescription treatment. He believed that its blotting-paper impression was more effective than its action on a refractory kidney ; nature or an operation being the sole healers. He would have completely sympathized with the old coachman who, on regaining his trap after an accident, drove to the nearest doctor. A cursory examination revealed bruises, and abrasions, with a state of shock, for which two pills, thrice daily, were prescribed. A few days later, another doctor discovered two broken ribs. For years after, the old man would tell the story, to end in the climax : " Two pills, one for each rib, I suppose ! " Blotting-paper Therapy !

However, apart from these rarer cases, which were common none-the-less in pre-scientific surgery days, the blotting-paper therapy at least does no harm in the physical order : it may even help nature by auto-suggestion. The case is far other in the moral order. An alms-giving pill will not cure commercial dishonesty ; nor will an economic oiling of the industrial wheels quicken the love-beats of an egoistic heart.

From September 4th to November 8th, 1939, a series of letters appeared in the *Times* on " Peace and War Aims." One writer remarked that the remedies proposed for curing a broken world were nothing more than a repetition of those proposed during the 1914-1919 upset, " a belief that the problem of world peace can be reduced to a problem of political engineering and solved by blue print." Very much to the point, Major Guy Kindersley wrote :

Sir,—Mr. H. G. Wells is obsessed with what I once heard described as " the supreme error of which the human mind is capable." Put shortly, it is that humanity is capable of lifting itself up by its own boot straps. All ideologies which are based upon this assumption are false, and all social systems based upon it are doomed to failure. For those who have eyes to see, this is the fundamental issue in the present conflict, and unfortunately Mr. Wells is on the wrong side.

It is the fundamental issue in much more than this conflict : it is the fundamental issue in the whole orientation of man's life. If man, to put it bluntly, makes a mess of his life, it is due to the fact that he has followed the boot-strap, self-elevating philosophers and scientists. Note well that it is not a question of man elevating his surroundings, of getting more light from lamps than from candles, from electricity than from oil ; of being more comfortable in a palace than in a log hut. No ! It is a question of man rising to a nobler plane of truth,

of justice, of sincerity, of love. And surely history shows that all the philosophers and teachers who have tried to do this without God have failed :

For My people have done two evils. They have  
forsaken Me, the fountain of living water,  
And have digged to themselves cisterns,  
broken cisterns, that can hold no water. (Jeremias, ii, 13.)

Many a man takes up his morning paper to read hopefully the progress of UNO. What really matters is the philosophical, and still more the religious, beliefs of the UNO members and of a world willing to subscribe to or reject, their beliefs. Now this creed is not formed nor, for the ordinary man, is it clearly formulated in UNO councils ; it is assimilated day by day through the newspaper article, the magazine article, the pamphlet, the books of men, whose culture wins them a following. Unfortunately for the interests of humanity the therapy is mostly of the blotting-paper type.

I take three booklets which I have been reading together these days : Gilbert Murray's *Anchor of Civilisation*, the Deneke Lecture of 1942, André Siegfried's *La Civilisation Occidentale*, the Romanes Lecture of 1945, and Jacques Maritain's *The Twilight of Civilization*.

The method of approach is as different as are the writers, yet when we have closed the three books we find in our hands a prescription for pills, differently coloured, to mend the broken bones.

Mr. Murray confesses to exasperation on reading that the cause of the disease is a lapse from Christian orthodoxy, or a prevalence of materialism. He has no patience with "the divers political parties, Left, Right, or merely eccentric," nor with the Economic adjusters. And his own remedy? ". . . it must be primarily a political cure, affecting international relations, not an ethical or religious cure affecting private morals, though of course any political cure must almost certainly have an ethical or religious basis." We await a definition of the "political cure," only to find that we "fight for the whole principle of what we call in Europe 'Christian Civilization' or humanity or even Hellenism . . . the great tradition Hellenic and Christian, of which you are the living heirs."

We are left completely in the dark as to the nature of 'Christian Civilization' and how it can offer us "primarily a political cure." Indeed we fancy that the very term *Christian Civilization*, instead of *Christian Culture*, explains the vagueness of the political cure, brewed neither by Leftists nor by Rightists, but rising with "the spirit of Man itself"—(the capital 'M' is Mr. Murray's)—out of an unformulated tradition-urn, Hellenic and Christian.

For Mr. André Siegfried the greatness of the West lies precisely in the self-raising, boot-strap policy: "L'homme est la mesure des choses . . . parole, selon Paul Valéry, essentiellement méditerranéenne. Disons également : européenne, car l'Europe est le seul



continent où pareille chose puisse être dite de la Nature.”—(Man is the measure of things . . . an expression, according to Paul Valéry, essentially mediterranean. Let us say equally european, for Europe is the only continent where such a thing may be said of Nature).—He quotes approvingly the strange handling by Renan of the text : “Render to Caesar the things which are Caesar’s, and to God the things that are God’s” ; for Renan finds in the antithesis, the justification of laicisation as “the base of true liberalism and true civilization.”

We cannot help wondering how “Man the measure of all things” is a thing said of Nature, with the capital ‘N.’ A bewilderment which leads us to Maritain’s *Twilight of Civilization*.

Maritain’s approach to the subject is promising. He vigorously reminds us that no salvation can come from a “concept which shuts man up in himself and separates him from Nature, Grace and God.” The first chapter on “The Crisis of Modern Humanism” is excellent : it is clear. But the moment he has to deal with the anti-Christian forces, just the very place where a clear statement of the malady is needed to set in relief the virtue of the remedy, he lands us in a morass of unintelligible jargon. What, for instance, are we to understand when he says : “German racism is a pathological protestation of nature, with its brutal force surging up from the hidden depths of the nourishing earth, with its needs for euphoria and power . . . a pathological protestation against an illusorily optimistic reason and, so to speak, against a clericalism of pure reason . . . there arises a sort of powerful religiosity, the religiosity inherent to the human substance in its most elemental physical fibres. God is invoked, but only by virtue of the natural desire rooted even in the fleshy vitality of man.” (Pp. 18, 19.)

The remedy offered is Christian humanism which will “substitute for a mercantile civilization . . . a personalist civilization and economy, through which there would pass a temporal refraction of the evangelic truths.”

Whatever a “temporal refraction of the evangelic truths” may mean, the world is in need of a healing agent more definite than this blotting-paper therapy.

If the prescriptions did no harm we might ignore them. But they do harm. The false, or misleading, diagnosis diverts attention from the broken ribs, and prevents men from realizing the only possible cure : “Seek first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be added unto you.” (Matt. vi, 33.) And the Master does not leave in the vague the character of the kingdom of God. It is a City set on a hill : “and a path and a way shall be there, it shall be called the holy way . . . it shall be unto you a straight way, so that fools shall not err therein.” (Isaias xxxv, 8.)

Mr. Murray has no patience with “a doctrine . . . unquestionably correct . . . constituting the one true Guide to Life.” (*The Anchor of*

*Civilization*, p. 12) ; yet, we should have thought that the very object of an anchor is to fix one unquestionably to a spot, so that adverse winds and contrary currents may not lead to mere drift.

The motion before the House of Lords, in December, 1944, "That the unifying forces of Europe stand in urgent need of strengthening" appeals to everyone. The difficulty arises when precision is required. Unity of action must be based upon unity of mutual understanding. How can there be unity of understanding, divorced from Mr. Murray's *bête noire*, "correct doctrines that constitute the one true guide to Life"? It would seem that, in spite of himself, he is forced back on this necessity, for "the great tradition, Hellenic and Christian," which offers him ultimately the anchor of hope, is nothing else than the doctrine of the one true Church, which, during those centuries called "dark," transformed the barbaric invaders by the light of a faith, one, unchanging and, because divine, unchangeable. To his audience, at the Deneke Lecture, Mr. Murray proposes salvation through this "great tradition, of which you are the living heirs . . . which has long known these enemies—the enemies, namely, which now threaten us)—and, with less powerful allies than you possess, has often conquered them before." Precisely! The tradition which brought about that, at the opening of the fifteenth century, Christendom was Europe and Europe was Christendom. The tradition, not upheld by "Churches," but by the Church, apostolic in succession, Catholic in the richest sense of universality: one Head, universally acknowledged; one explanation of the value of human life, not economic, not political, not even social in the sense of earthly fellowship, so noised abroad to-day, but supernatural.

Once the supernatural was lost sight of, the measuring rods, a variety of them, of space and time were invoked to size up man, and to make known his wants according to this earthly scale of measurement. The inevitable followed. Ready-made outfits were supplied by firms competing for individual custom: the personal dignity of the customer was more and more submerged in the "herd" appreciation. A common suffix, *-ism*, gave the glamour of system: Liberalism, Socialism, Atheism, Statism, Individualism. A club membership spirit developed, suggesting different haunts, with a narrowing range of different ideals.

Three movements, each in its own way, were responsible for the division, which has ended in the chaos of Europe. The Renaissance, starting with quite a praiseworthy appreciation of forgotten treasures of literature and art, soon split Europe into two intellectual camps, now called Christian and Pagan Humanism. The one built up a pragmatic code of morals; the other held to the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. The Reformation split the heart of Europe. Religion became a matter of national allegiance, instead of universal brotherhood, under a common Father, the Pope.

In one of the most recent of the Oxford Home Affairs pamphlets, *The Churches in Britain*, the Bishop of Durham, Dr. Williams, speaking of England, clearly brings out this unhappy division. He writes :

"The change came in the Reformation . . . it was in essence . . . revolutionary. . . . Our concern is with its results. The greatest and most immediate of these was the appearance of a Church of England independent of Rome but dependent on the Crown, which now assumed the supremacy over all persons and causes, ecclesiastical as well as temporal. Henceforward there is a national Church, regarded by Rome as schismatic." The moment national interests are in the foreground, politics must enter, at least by the back door. They did. Needless to pursue the theme. History bears only too clear testimony to the bishop's further remark : "During the later sixteenth century and the seventeenth it became clear that the national Church could not satisfy the desires of many who wished for more radical changes in doctrine, discipline, and Church government than the Crown and the national Church were prepared to authorize." (Pp. 5-6.) So arose the "Churches." A national Church can never be Catholic.

The Industrial movement, buttressed by a Liberalism alien to the spirit of Christianity, completed the dismemberment. It has left us the mortgaged heritage of the Social Problem.

The sick old world presents herself at the consulting rooms of the would-be physicians. The result ? Blotting-paper therapy.

The remedies proposed are prescriptions based on the very doctrines which caused the ills.

Is there, then, no balm in Gelaad ? There is ; but only one. In his discourse to the newly-created Cardinals, the Holy Father stressed the fact :

Here, too, it is the Church that can cure and heal such a wound, and she does it by having access to the innermost sanctuary of the human being, and placing him at the centre of the whole social order. Now this human being is not man in the abstract, nor considered only in the order of pure nature, but the complete man as he is in the sight of God, his Creator and Redeemer ; as he is in his concrete and historical reality which could not be lost sight of without compromising the normal functioning of human intercourse. The Church knows it and acts accordingly. . . . Since she is ever bent intently over man, watching his every heart-beat, she knows all his rich qualities, and is alive to his aspirations with that clear-sighted intuition and penetrating appreciation which can come only from the supernatural illumination of Christ's teaching and the supernatural warmth of his divine charity.

An admirer of Mr. Maritain's—(I myself have been an appreciative reader of his works)—might think that I have not done justice to his closing chapter which finds the remedy precisely in "the activation of the Christian ferment." My objection is to the vagueness of the prescription. The word "Catholic" does not occur in the chapter except in a reference to American bishops. Unfortunately the word

"Christian" has become too vague. It includes "The Churches" which, in spite of the devotedly-planned Oecumenical Movements, still retain their fundamental differences; and in which, to quote again from the Bishop of Durham: "There is, of course, always the menacing danger that Churches will be the parasites of dominant social and political parties." (P. 31.) Even in the one Church, "the most characteristic expression of English Christianity," claiming his allegiance, the bishop finds "many complicated anomalies in the character and conduct of its councils," and he recognises that, in episcopal failure to procure better discipline, "The answer is discouraging, but conclusive. They cannot." (P. 11.)

We seek a Europe, in which all men will attach the same significance to human life, will admit the same moral principles of conduct. Such a Europe existed, when the fine flower of its culture was one with Catholicism. Such a unity exists to-day amongst people otherwise so different in culture. Be the Catholics English, French, Chinese, Japanese, American, they find themselves at home, yes, quite at home, in the Vatican City: their brotherhood is not a committee convention. It is based on the recognition of a common Father. They call him the Holy Father, not through any immature canonization impulse, but because they believe that, through him, as through Peter, the promise of Christ's abiding always to offer His peace to willing souls is fulfilled.

Round this throne, and round this throne alone, unity has existed in the past, and unity can be found in the future.

GEORGE BYRNE.

## "THE MONTH" FORWARDING SCHEME

### IMPORTANT NOTICE

Will readers and missionaries who are members of the Forwarding Scheme, please note that during a 1945 air attack on London all the reference books and the card index relating to the Scheme were destroyed when the private house where the work has been done since the war, was severely damaged. All names and addresses were lost and the Hon. Secretary is therefore unable to write to those who have written but failed to enclose their full address. It is also not possible to look up information which some missionaries and readers have asked for. There was a waiting list of Missionaries who had asked for *THE MONTH*; this too was lost. Will those who would like *THE MONTH* please send their names and addresses, in **BLOCK** letters, to the secretary?



## THE CONSECRATION OF MATTHEW PARKER<sup>1</sup>

THE generally accepted view as regards the consecration of Matthew Parker, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, is that he was consecrated in Lambeth Chapel on December 17th, 1559, by Barlow, assisted by Scory, Coverdale and Hodgkins, the form or rite used being that of the Edwardian Ordinal of 1552. In opposition to this, Mr. Whitebrook contends that the Marian bishop, Anthony Kitchen, performed the rite of consecration on October 29th, 1559, according to the Catholic Pontifical; but he specifies neither place nor assistants.

Before examining and evaluating this new theory, it may be well to summarise the principal evidence for the accepted view. [I] In the first place there is the Lambeth Register which from folio 2 to folio 11 details the *congé d'élire*, the election, the Royal Assent, the signification of that assent with the commission or mandate to confirm the election and consecrate, the actual ceremonies of the consecration, the mandate to install the new Archbishop and the subsequent installation itself.<sup>2</sup> [II] A contemporary manuscript, preserved in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, gives an account of the consecration, and differs from the Lambeth Register only in unimportant points such as substituting "olim" for "quondam," and in stating the words of consecration in Latin instead of in English.<sup>3</sup> [III] A third document is to be found in the British Museum among the manuscripts of John Foxe, who died in 1587.<sup>4</sup> This in part agrees verbatim with the Lambeth Register, but in at least two important items differs from it, though in no way contradicting it, thereby showing that it is not entirely dependent on the Register.

In addition to this evidence, the date of consecration, December 17th—a crucial point for Mr. Whitebrook's theory—is confirmed by [IV] the contemporary Machyn Diary; [V] the manuscript of the Parker Diary; [VI] the statutes drawn up by Parker for the Court of Arches, containing a calendar in which his consecration "XVI Kal. Jan." is recorded; [VII] the table of the consecration of Parker himself, and of other bishops consecrated by him, 1560-1571, printed in some of the 1572 editions of his *De Antiquitate Ecclesiae Anglicanae*;

<sup>1</sup> *The Consecration of Matthew Parker*. By J. C. Whitebrook. London: A. R. Mowbray and Co. Pp. 131. Price, 8s. 6d. n. 1945.

<sup>2</sup> The pertinent part of the Register is printed in Haddon's Edition of Archbishop Bramhall's works, Oxford, 1844, III, 173-210.

<sup>3</sup> It is printed in Haddon, *op. cit.* III, 210-213.

<sup>4</sup> Harleian MSS. 419, f. 149. It is printed by E. E. Escourt in *The Question of Anglican Ordinations Discussed*, London, 1873, 104-107, and is given in facsimile in the frontispiece of the same work.

[VIII] the manuscript note in the hand of Parker's eldest son in the copy of the same work, preserved in the Lambeth Library ; [IX] the two Latin lives of Parker, the manuscript of one of which is in the hand of Jocelyn, Parker's secretary ; and [X] the English Puritan life of Parker, printed in 1574.

The later date, December 17th, as opposed to October 29th, finds further corroboration in [XI] the Register of the Chapter of Canterbury, recording acts of jurisdiction during the vacancy of the archbishopric up to December 8th, the day, that is, before the date of the confirmation of his election, as given in the Lambeth Register ; [XII] Royal Letters Patent of November 20th, presenting John Pilkington to a prebend in St. Paul's Cathedral during the vacancy of the See of London, and addressed not to the Archbishop, but to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury, implying that the archiepiscopal see was also vacant,<sup>1</sup> and last but by no means least in importance, [XIII] the Royal Commission or mandate of December 6th, 1559, to confirm the election of Parker and proceed with his consecration, which is entered on the Patent Rolls.<sup>2</sup>

Of these thirteen pieces of evidence, Mr. Whitebrook deals only with the first, the fourth and the fifth, dismissing the Royal Patent of December 6th of which more later, in two or three lines. Therein lies one very grave defect of the work : it is selective and fails to consider all the evidence.

The Parker Diary, the fifth in the above list, may be discussed briefly. The author adduces reasons, not all of them very convincing, to show that the roll, on which is recorded the date of the Archbishop's consecration, is not a transcript made by Parker himself. This, if granted, would preclude it being taken as Parker's own statement, but would not necessarily invalidate the statement itself.

Over the Machyn Diary, the fourth in the list, Mr. Whitebrook appears somewhat hesitant. He first states that it does not "indicate whether the ceremony mentioned was that of consecration or of installation or a new and reformed rite of a special nature, apt for the vague description given."<sup>3</sup> Unfortunately the manuscript of Machyn's Diary is not at present open to inspection, but the part quoted by Canon Estcourt seems clear enough.<sup>4</sup> It is better perhaps to reproduce it here and let the reader judge : the upper part of the page is burnt away—but the entry then runs :

[Park]er electyd bishope of Canterbere !

The xvii day of Desember was the new byshope of [Cantarbury] doctur Parker, was (*sic*) mad ther at Lambeth.

<sup>1</sup> The year is not given, but can be supplied from the Register of Grindall, Bishop of London, which gives the date of the actual installation of Pilkington as February 10th, 1560. Other Letters Patent implying the vacancy of the archbishopric at a date later than October 29th, 1559, are referred to by Haddon, *op. cit.* III, 217.

<sup>2</sup> For this summary of evidence cf. Haddon, *op. cit.* III, 85, 217 ; 11, 12 and Escourt, *op. cit.*, 99.

<sup>3</sup> P. 39.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.* 96.

The xx day of Desember afor non, was Saint Thomas evyn, my lord of Cantarbere whent to Bow chyrche and ther wher V byshopes mad.

Mr. Whitebrook quotes only the first and third lines of the above, and omits the important words "doctur Parker." But he is evidently not too happy about the entry, for later he suggests that it is an interpolation. Without consultation of the manuscript itself it is not within the competence of the reviewer to pass definite judgment, but the reasons alleged do not appear very compelling.

As for the Lambeth Register, for long open to suspicion, the author brings forward arguments, for the ordinary reader, it must be confessed, not very clearly exposed, to prove that its present form is not contemporary with the events it chronicles. He assigns its actual make-up to the second decade of the following century, though based possibly on contemporary memoranda. Really it is a point of no great importance, for if the new theory as to Parker's consecration is correct, then deliberate falsification of the register seems to be the only possible conclusion, and at what date that falsification was made is of secondary concern. Moreover, from the evidence listed above, it is clear that the account of Parker's consecration, such as it is to be found in the Lambeth Register was current early in Elizabeth's reign.<sup>1</sup>

The late date, however, if indeed it be of late date, does not necessarily imply that the Register is unreliable. Mr. Whitebrook recognises this and proceeds to give reasons to show that in fact it is unreliable. He cites a passage from the preamble of the Old Calendar of the volume Mellersee, i.e., the register of wills in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury from December 10th, 1559, to January 1st, 1560, which places the former date in the first year of the archbishop's consecration.<sup>2</sup> He enforces this by a passage from the Probate Act Book, i.e., wills attested from December 9th, 1559, by Walter Haddon, Doctor of Laws in the Prerogative Court, in which Parker is referred to as *elect and consecrated* by that day. Further corroboration is found in the Administration Act Book, i.e., the register of the estates of those who died intestate, dating from December 9th, 1559, which refers to Parker as Archbishop *tout court*. Here, he concludes, are three contemporary passages which state that Parker was consecrated by December 10th, 1559, in one instance; by December 9th in the other two. But when it is remembered that according to the Lambeth Register, the archbishop's election was confirmed on December 9th, from which date the registrars would be legally empowered to act by the authority of the Archbishop instead of by that of the Dean and Chapter, the passages quoted may by no means appear so apodictic as Mr. Whitebrook suggests. The words *consecration* and *consecrated* in the first two

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Force's MSS., No. 3 above. Cf. also the evidence as to the date of consecration, being December 17th.

<sup>2</sup> It would surely have been much to the point to have given some details of the Old Calendar; of what date it is, and in whose hands. No such details are supplied.

instances may easily be slips of the pen for *confirmation* and *confirmed*, especially as the legal authority, as already stated, would derive from the date of his confirmation. This surmise indeed is reinforced by the strange conjunction in the second passage of the words *elect* and *consecrated*. *Elect* by itself would stand though it would not be of legal significance; and *consecrated* by itself, but surely not *elect and consecrated*; whereas 'elect and confirmed' for the reasons stated is quite intelligible. The third passage is of no great weight, for Parker himself in a letter of August 27th, 1559, signed himself "Matt C." and even Mr. Whitebrook does not contend that the confirmation of the election was as early as that, still less that Parker was archbishop by that date.<sup>1</sup>

Further testimony, the author maintains, is afforded by the Archbishop himself. "In every official document in which Parker mentions the year of his consecration, that consecration shows date earlier than the date assigned in the Lambeth Register, when the date of the document falls between October 29th and December 17th. In other months for obvious mathematical reasons that will appear, the year of consecration concurs with that of the Lambeth record."<sup>2</sup> Thus, in a commission of November 6th, 1563, signed by the Archbishop, this date is represented as falling in the *fifth* year of "our consecration." Similarly October 27th, 1572, is given as within the *thirteenth* year of that event. Four examples are adduced out of a very large number. There is only one exception of which the explanation suggested by Mr. Whitebrook certainly has the merit of ingenuity. This argument has assuredly its force: on the other hand, such evidence is quite at variance with the official signification of the Royal Assent and the mandate to confirm the election and proceed to consecration which is entered on the Rolls and dated December 6th, 1559, showing indubitably that by that date Parker was still unconsecrated.<sup>3</sup> What the explanation is of the erroneous calculation in such documents signed by Parker remains a problem for the historian.

The actual date of October 29th according to this new theory is fixed by another document. There is a letter of Queen Elizabeth to the Lord Treasurer and the Barons of the Exchequer in which she states that owing to the exchange of the temporalities of the Sees with the crown being still unsettled, the Archbishop-elect of Canterbury, and the other elect Bishops of London, Ely, Hereford and Chichester remain unconsecrated. She therefore urges the officials to complete the change with all expedition. This letter is dated October 26th, 1559; and as October 29th is the earliest date of consecration in the documents just discussed, signed by Parker, Mr. Whitebrook concludes that October 29th, a Sunday in 1559, was the day on which the Arch-

<sup>1</sup> Estcourt, op. cit. 83-84, where in addition to this example he gives an instance of a commission of October 20th, 1559, being addressed to Parker, Grindall and Coxe by their full titles as Bishops without the word *elect*.

<sup>2</sup> P. 35.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *infra* for a discussion of this document.



bishop was consecrated. An obvious comment is that the completion of the exchange of the temporalities, not to say the preparation for the consecration, must have been very expeditious indeed. Two days at the most to complete everything ! Of course it may have been so, but it hardly seems probable.

The next section of the book in which the author endeavours to prove that it was Kitchen who consecrated Parker is very weak, and will certainly not satisfy the critically-minded. The fact is, there is little or no evidence of real value. About May, 1561, one of the Catholic exiles, the well known Nicholas Sanders, in a report to Cardinal Moroni relates of Kitchen : " Catholics doubt if he ought to be considered a bishop, because after the reconciliation of the kingdom under Mary he alone is said not to have sought confirmation from the Apostolic See and it is therefore not to be wondered at that he yields to schism and consecrates pseudo-bishops outside the Catholic Church."<sup>1</sup> The first part of Sanders' statement—he qualifies it with a "*dicitur*"—is certainly erroneous, as can be proved by the actual document of Kitchen's reconciliation published by Canon Estcourt as long ago as 1873.<sup>2</sup> Yet Mr. Whitebrook still takes the non-reconciliation as an established fact.<sup>3</sup> The second becomes for him " the definite statement that Kitchen consecrated Parker " !<sup>4</sup> Another report to Cardinal Moroni, possibly also by Sanders, and written after June 15th, 1561, states that the Bishop of Llandaff (Kitchen) has allowed himself to be led astray by the Queen of England ; " and by him have been consecrated *all* those schismatic and heretical bishops whom the Queen has made by her authority."<sup>5</sup> This can certainly be proved erroneous in the case of the Protestant Bishops, Grindall, Coxe, Sandys, Meyrick, Bullingham and Jewell, from the significations of the royal assent and mandates to confirm the election and consecrate, entered on the Patent Rolls.<sup>6</sup> All that can be legitimately concluded from this evidence is that a rumour had reached the continent that Kitchen was consecrating bishops ; and in point of fact, as has been shown, an erroneous rumour, just as was that of his not seeking reconciliation under Mary.

<sup>1</sup> C. R. S., I, 1-47. The above translation is taken from this volume (p. 40) as it appears slightly more accurate than that given in the book under review.

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit. Appendix xv., pp. xl-xlii.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. pp. 61, 84.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. p. 84.

<sup>5</sup> Fr. Stevenson's transcript from Vat. Arch. Arm. (xiv, vol. 28, f. 167).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Calendar of Patent Rolls, Elizabeth, vol. 1, for Grindall, December 18th (p. 559) ; Coxe and Sandys, December 18th (p. 450) ; Meyrick, December 18th (p. 454) ; Jewell, December 27th (p. 408). The reviewer thought it needless to proceed further with other bishops. Mr. Whitebrook endeavours to throw doubt on the date, December 21st, 1559, given in the Lambeth Register for the consecration of Coxe, by saying : " If so (if Coxe were consecrated on December 21st) Cecil and the Queen were taken by surprise ; for a writ to consecrate Coxe is recorded as issuing seven days later, December 28th, 1559." This is really a hoary error into which Mr. Whitebrook has no doubt been led by Rymer. It was corrected over a hundred years ago by Haddon, op. cit. III, 218, who noted : " Mandate also to confirm and consecrate, mis-dated December 28th in first edition of Rymer (xxviii for xviii), but dated correctly December 18th in the Rolls itself and in Rymer's own table of contents."

Mr. Whitebrook, however, endeavours to find support for his theory that Kitchen consecrated Parker, in the controversy between the Catholic exile, Harding, and Jewell, the Protestant Bishop of Salisbury. In the rather unparliamentary language common in controversy of those days, Harding wrote : "As by Aristotle a city cannot consist of bastards, no more can the Church of England consist of such bastard bishops as ye be. One must I still except who is a true bishop (as I understand) though a false man by apostasy and going from his faith and religion." Now, there is no indication that Harding was here referring to Kitchen or that Jewell so understood him. Yet Mr. Whitebrook must have it that Kitchen is meant. All the probabilities are against it. Harding, a theologian, who had witnessed the reconciliation under Mary and had himself been promoted to a prebend in Winchester in 1554, would hardly use the phrase "as I understand" of Kitchen, who was consecrated in Henry VIII's reign and reconciled in Mary's. And what is more, Kitchen had been dead a year and a half or two years when in 1565 Harding's "Confutation" was published. So Mr. Whitebrook has to assert, as he does without the glimmer of proof, that Harding did not know of Kitchen's death. It would appear far more probable that Harding was referring to Barlow about whose consecration there has always been obscurity. The elaborate argument founded therefore on this passage has no force. It is pure surmise—improbable in itself, and certainly not evidence.

As regards the further question of the rite used, Mr. Whitebrook produces not a scrap of solid evidence. He deals simply in surmises. All the evidence, in fact, that exists goes to show that the Edwardian Ordinal of 1552 was used.

This outline and the arguments adduced have been considered at some length in order to do justice to the book, which certainly has the merit of ingenuity if not of historical accuracy. There is, however, one document which of itself suffices to refute this new theory—viz., the signification of the royal assent and mandate to confirm Parker's election and proceed to consecrate him, with its extraordinary "supplentes" or dispensing clause, entered on the Patent Rolls and dated December 6th, 1559, which proves beyond doubt that he was still not consecrated by that date. Mr. Whitebrook dismisses this document with the remark that it "is without seal or authentication of any sort that would attach to a sealed document."<sup>1</sup> But apart from the fact that his theory and the rejection of this document would imply deliberate falsification in the Rolls as well as in the Lambeth Register, and this on no inconsiderable scale, he has quite overlooked the existence in the Record Office of a draft of this patent of December 6th, containing the "supplentes" clause, with the autograph signatures of the six gentlemen who were consulted on the matter, and Cecil's own handwriting upon it, showing that this draft had been submitted

<sup>1</sup> P. 87.

to his supervision. Nor does he take account that this very Patent is referred to in the statute, 8 Elizabeth, c. 1.<sup>1</sup>

In order to make this last statement clear, it will be necessary to give briefly the history of this "supplentes" or dispensing clause. It must be recalled that the statute, 25 Henry VIII, c. 20, which had been repealed under Mary was revived by Elizabeth's first Parliament. This statute required that in the case of a vacancy of an archbishopric, the signification of the royal assent and the mandate to confirm the election and consecrate the person elected, should be issued to one archbishop and two other bishops or else to four bishops within the realm or within the King's dominions.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, after the election of Parker on August 1st, 1559, a signification of the royal assent and mandate to confirm the election and consecrate him, was issued on September 9th, 1559, to Tunstall, Bourne, Poole, Kitchen, Barlow and Scory. Hopes were evidently entertained of the four Marian bishops, still in possession of their Sees, the first four named. But they proved groundless, and the first three were soon deprived of their Sees.<sup>3</sup> Cecil and Parker were therefore in a quandary: there was neither an archbishop nor four bishops within the realm in the meaning of the Act to undertake the consecration. This is clearly proved by a document,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Escourt, *op. cit.* 88. He gives a facsimile of that part of the draft which contains the 'supplentes' clause with the opinion of the six as to its legal bearing and their appended signatures.

<sup>2</sup> The pertinent passage of 25 Henry c. 20 runs: "The King's Highnesse by his Letters Patent under his Great Seale, shall signifie the said election to one Archbishop and two other Bishops, or else four Bishops within this Realme or within any other the King's Dominions to be assigned by the King's Highnesse, his Heires or Successors, requiring and commanding the said Archbishop and Bishops with all speed and celerity to confirme the said election and to invest and consecrate the said person so elected to the office and dignity that he is elected unto." (F. Pulton, *A Collection of Statutes*, London, 1640, 549.)

<sup>3</sup> Machyn (Diary 214) gives September 28th, 1559, as the date of Tunstall's deprivation of the See of Durham. He was certainly deprived before October 1st, as Cecil announces the fact in a letter of that date to Throckmorton, (*Foreign Calendar*), though from other letters he seems to have had hopes that Tunstall might relent and so be restored. These hopes were finally extinguished by October 5th, cf. Cecil to Parker, October 5th, 1559, and Phillips, *Extinction of the Ancient Hierarchy*, London, 1905, 176-178. A commission was issued on October 18th to administer the oath of supremacy to Bourne, Bishop of Bath and Wells, directing steps to be taken in case of refusal. He was deprived before October 26th, as the See was bracketed with others in a list of vacant dioceses of that date. R.O. Dom. Eliz. vii, No. 19, cf. Bert, *The Elizabethan Religious Settlement*, 222, and Escourt, *op. cit.* 85. A list of prisoners in the Tower on July 3rd, 1561, mentions Bourne "late Bishop of Bath and Wells," as having been imprisoned there since June 18th, 1560. (C.R.S., I, 56.) When Poole of Peterborough was deprived cannot be ascertained exactly, but it certainly took place before November, when the temporalities of the See were seized, cf. Bridgett and Knox, *The True Story of the Catholic Hierarchy*, London, 1889, 81. Machyn states that Kitchen was deprived of the See of Llandaff on June 21st, 1559, and this finds support in a letter written by the Mantuan Representative in London, H. Schifanoja, on June 27th, in which he numbers him among the deprived bishops. (Venetian Calendar, 105, cf. Phillips, *op. cit.* 13.) If this is not an error, it may be that the deprivation was only provisional; for about this time Kitchen began to waver as regards the Oath of Supremacy. (Quadra to Philip II, July 12th, 1559, Spanish Calendar, 86), and on July 18th he wrote to the Queen asking time for further consideration yet promising that with all his power, cunning and ability he would set forth in his own person and cause all others under his jurisdiction to accept and obey the whole course of religion now approved and would require the oath from others as the statute required. (Cf. Escourt, *op. cit.* 93, and Bridgett and Knox, *op. cit.* 30.) On August 5th, 1559, the Venetian Ambassador in Flanders wrote: "We hear from those parts (England) that amongst all the Bishops there the only one who would take the form of oath . . . was the Bishop of Llandaff." (Venetian Calendar, Tiepolo to the Doge and Senate, August 1st, 1559).

drawn up by some official in view of Parker's consecration and as the comments in the hands of Cecil and Parker in the left and right margins respectively show, submitted to them for their supervision.<sup>1</sup> Only three clauses of this document need to be considered. The first states that suit is to be made to the Queen for Letters Patent for the confirmation of the election and subsequent consecration. In the margin Cecil has written: "the copy of this wold be sent hither."<sup>2</sup> The second clause declares the requirements of the statute, 25 Henry VIII, c. 20, as stated above; and Cecil's revealing comment runs: "There is no archbishop nor four bishops to be had. Wherefore *querendum*." In the fifth clause it is stated that the order of King Edward's book is to be observed, for "there is none other speciall made in this last session of Parliament." In the margin Cecil has noted: "This book is not established by Parliament."<sup>3</sup>

To resolve these two difficulties, the want of legal consecrating bishops, and the lack of legality as regards the Edwardian Ordinal, the matter was referred to a committee of the Protestant party, consisting of four canonists and two lawyers.<sup>4</sup> These drew up a commission in the usual form addressed to Kitchen, Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, Hodgkins the suffragan of Bedford, Salisbury, suffragan of Thetford, and Bale who had been Bishop of Ossory but had been deprived under Mary:<sup>5</sup> and they added an extraordinary "supplentes" clause, dispensing with any disabilities in the persons to whom it was addressed or any illegalities in the acts done by them.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The document is printed and a facsimile of it also given by Estcourt, *op. cit.*, p. 86. The date, as Escourt points out, must be after September 30th, *ibid.*, 87.

<sup>2</sup> Possibly the draft of the Letters Patent of December 6th already referred to., *supra*.

<sup>3</sup> This remark becomes an argument for Mr. Whitebrook. Cecil pronounced on the matter (i.e., the illegality of the Edwardian Ordinal) contemporaneously. He stated accurately that those forms *could not be used*, because they had not the authority of Parliament, "and he certainly took no steps at the appropriate time to obtain the sanction," p. 49. This is an example of the overstatement that is too frequently employed in the book. The second part of the sentence is misleading. He did take steps to sanction it by the supreme authority of the Queen, *cf. infra*. A Bill for "collating of Bishops by the Queen's Highness and with what rites and Ceremonies" had been introduced in Elizabeth's first Parliament, but after some progress it was apparently dropped. For the history of this "law," *cf. Estcourt, op. cit.*, 100-101.

<sup>4</sup> William May, Edward Leedes, Henry Harvey, Nicholas Bullingham, later Bishop of Lincoln, Robert Weston and Thomas Yale. For their careers, *cf. Haddon, op. cit.* III, 180, and Escourt, *op. cit.*, 88.

<sup>5</sup> Barlow, if ever consecrated, was Bishop of Bath and Wells under Edward VI, resigned or was deprived under Mary, and eventually escaped to the continent. Scory, formerly Bishop of Rochester in Edward VI's reign, was deprived under Mary. Coverdale was appointed to the See of Exeter by Edward VI, but was deprived in 1553. Hodgkins and Salisbury as suffragans did not come within the meaning of "Bishops within the realm" (25 Henry, c. 20), i.e., as in possession of Sees within the sovereign's dominions.

Salisbury's Christian name is given as Richard instead of John in the document, a mistake that is repeated both in the Rolls and in the Lambeth register, a fact which shows the connection between all three documents, *cf. Estcourt, op. cit.* 89.

<sup>6</sup> The clause runs: "Supplentes nihilominus suprema auctoritate regia ex mero motu et certa scientia nostris, si quid aut in his quae juxta mandatum nostrum praedictum per vos fient, aut in vobis aut vestrum aliquo, conditione, statu, facultate vestris, ad praemissa perficienda desit aut deerit, eorum quae per statuta hujus regni nostri aut per leges ecclesiasticas in hac parte requiruntur aut necessaria sunt, temporis ratione et rerum necessitate id postulante." Strype's translation is as follows: "Supplying nevertheless by our supreme authority royal, of our mere motion and certain knowledge, if anything be or shall be wanting either in the things which according to our foresaid commandment (i.e., the



They added their opinion, with their signatures appended, that in this form, i.e., with the added dispensing clause, the Queen might lawfully authorize the persons named to confirm the election and consecrate the elect, and the persons themselves carry into effect the Queen's mandate.<sup>1</sup>

This opinion was accepted. On December 6th, 1559, a new commission in the form suggested, i.e., with the addition of the "suppentes" clause was issued to Kitchen, Barlow, and the rest previously named, signifying the royal assent and commanding them or "at the least four of them" to confirm the election and consecrate Parker.<sup>2</sup> In accordance with this, his election was confirmed on December 9th, 1559, in Bow Church, the Archbishop elect being represented by his proxy, Nicholas Bullingham, and the consecration followed on December 17th at Lambeth Chapel.<sup>3</sup>

A few years later after the severer penal laws of 1563 had been passed, imposing the penalty of a *praemunire* for a first refusal to take the oath of supremacy and the penalty of death, as in High Treason, for a second, Horne, Bishop of Winchester, with the approval of Grindall, Bishop of London and of Archbishop Parker himself, administered the oath to Bonner.<sup>4</sup> The Marian bishop refused to take it and on May 1st the case was immediately drawn up and returned to the Court of King's Bench by Horne's chancellor.<sup>5</sup> In the October following Bonner was summoned before the court to answer the charge.<sup>6</sup> He pleaded not guilty, raising many objections to the charge, which were disallowed; but his main contention was that Horne was not a bishop according to the statutes of the realm and was therefore not legally entitled to administer the oath. His reasons for his assertions appear

commission or mandate) shall by you be done or in you or any of you by reason of your condition state or power to perform the premisses; anything, I say, required or necessary in this behalf, either by the statutes of this our kingdom or by the ecclesiastical laws; the circumstances of the time or the necessity of things requiring it." (London, 1711, 55.) (Strype, *Parker*, London, 1711, 55.)

<sup>1</sup> A facsimile of the "suppentes" clause with the opinion and autograph signatures of the six who drew it up, is printed in Escourt, op. cit., 88, from the document in the Record Office.

<sup>2</sup> The Letters Patent are printed in the Calendar of Patent Rolls, Elizabeth, vol. I, 449, and also by Haddon, op. cit. III, 74-75.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Whitebrook writes: "Barlow is therefore represented by the register, as referring to the September authority (i.e., the mandate of September 9th) to Tunstall, Kitchen and the others to consecrate," p. 87. This surely is an error, and it is difficult to see how it could be made if there had been reference to the Lambeth Register. Barlow in that account is represented as referring to the mandate of December 6th with its extraordinary "suppentes" clause, no less than six times. Cf. Haddon, op. cit. III, 183, 185, 186, 201, 202, 203, 206. The commission of December 6th is referred to on p. 175 and is given in full with the "suppentes" clause as the authority for confirming and consecrating (*ibid.*, 178-179.) Tunstall's name is not once mentioned.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Whitebrook (p. 101) represents Parker as being incensed against Horne for administering the oath. This is in flat contradiction with Grindall's letter to Cecil, May 2nd, 1564, in which he writes: "For to Bonner's oath, I did of purpose not trouble you with it aforehand, that if any misliked the matter, ye might liquido iurare ye were not privy to it. Notwithstanding, I had my Lord of Canterbury's approbation by letters, and I used good advice of the learned in the laws." (R.O. Dom. Eliz. XXXIV, No. 1.)

<sup>5</sup> The letter is printed by R. W. Dixon in his *History of the Church of England*, Oxford, 1902, vol. VI, 31 note.

<sup>6</sup> De Silva to Philip II, London, October 14th, 1564, Spanish Calendar, p. 388, No. 271.

to have corresponded exactly with the two difficulties which had so embarrassed Cecil before the consecration of Parker, first that Horne had not been consecrated according to the statute, 25 Henry VIII, c. 20,<sup>1</sup> and secondly that he had been made bishop according to the book of Edward VI not yet authorized by Parliament.<sup>2</sup>

It was an adroit move on the part of Bonner, who was well skilled in law, and caused considerable commotion, for it touched also the consecration of Parker himself and in consequence of all the bishops consecrated by him. In fact, according to the manuscript last quoted this point was actually raised. "It was much debated," writes Sir James Dyer, "among all the justices at Lord Catlyne's chambers, whether Bonner may give evidence upon this issue, that he is not guilty thereof, that the said Bishop of Winchester was not a bishop at the time of the offering of the oath and resolved by all that if the truth of the matter be such in fact he shall be well received to it upon this issue and the jury shall try it."<sup>3</sup> The trial, however, never took place: Bonner was cited again and again but always remanded.<sup>4</sup>

The case, indeed, caused a stir throughout the country. On March 30th, 1565, Randolph wrote to Cecil from Scotland of a rumour that had gone abroad there "that Bonner in his defence at his arraignment said that there was never a lawful bishop in England which so astonished a great number of the best learned that yet they knew not what answer to give him; and when it was determined he should have suffered, he is remitted to the place from whence he came, and no more said to him."<sup>5</sup> And on June 23rd of the same year, Dr. Young, Archbishop of York, in a letter to the Queen, assured her that "the cause of the inconstancy and murmuring of the people in the north, touching the alteration of religion, arises . . . chiefly through the remiss dealing of the judges and lawyers of the King's Bench (who wrest the laws at their pleasure) with Mr. Bonner, late Bishop of London, and Doctor Palmes. They have long been dallied with, but people persuade themselves that you would not have such offenders punished."<sup>6</sup> In fact the matter was of such gravity that it was thought better to deal with it in Parliament and accordingly an Act was passed (in 1566) legalising the position of the archbishops and bishops.<sup>7</sup>

The preamble of this statute evidences the wide commotion caused by Bonner's case, declaring that "diverse questions by overmuch

<sup>1</sup> "Especially for that he the said Dr. Horne was not lawfully consecrated according to the laws and statutes of this realm; especially of 25 Henry VIII, c. 20." Strype, *Annals of the Reformation*, London, 1725, vol. I, 380, citing from a manuscript in Bonner's own hand.

<sup>2</sup> Strype, *Parker*, London, 1711, 60, citing the manuscript Cleopatra F. in the Cotton collection.

<sup>3</sup> *Reports of Cases in the Reign of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, and Q. Elizabeth*, by Sir James Dyer, translated by Vaillant, 1794, vol. II, 233-234. Sir James Dyer was President of the Court of Common Pleas. He died in 1582.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. J. H. Pollen, *THE MONTH*, October, 1902, p. 430; Phillips, *op. cit.*, 316, and the *Coram Rege* Rolls, to which reference is there given.

<sup>5</sup> Cited by Phillips, *op. cit.*, 324, from Calendar of Scottish Papers.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* from Calendar Domestic Addenda, June 23rd, 1565.

<sup>7</sup> 8. Elizabeth, c. 1.

boldness of speech and talk amongst many of the common sort of people, being unlearned, hath lately grown upon the making and consecrating of archbishops and bishops within this realm, whether the same were and be duly and orderly done according to the law." The mention here and in other passages of the statute of archbishops and bishops may indicate, as was indeed the case, that Bonner's plea touched not merely Horne, but other prelates as well, even archbishops of whom Parker was one. The statute then refers to the Act of 25 Henry, c. 20, and goes on to declare that "Edward VI in his time by authority of Parliament caused a godly and virtuous book intituled : The Book of Common Prayer and administration of sacraments and other rites and ceremonies in the Church of England, to be made and set forth, not only for one uniform order of service, Common Prayer and the administration of sacraments to be used within this realm and other his dominions, but also did add and put to the same book very good and godly order of the manner and form how archbishops, bishops, priests, deacons and ministers should from time to time be consecrated, made and ordered within this realm and other his dominions as by the same more plainly will and may appear." Both these acts, it states, that of 25 Henry, c. 20, and that of Edward VI, though repealed by Mary were revived in the first Parliament of the Queen's reign. In a word the act quietly introduced the fiction, for fiction it is, that the Ordinal of Edward VI was part and parcel of the Book of Common Prayer and so was made legal when that was restored,—quite against Cecil's former comment : "This book is not established by Parliament."

The further passage of this statute which makes clear both the rite used and the commission acted on, namely that of December 6th, must be quoted in full. After referring to the royal supremacy, it continues as follows :

Whereupon our sovereign Lady the Queen's most excellent majesty . . . by her supreme authority at divers times since the beginning of her majesty's reign, caused divers and sundry grave and well-learned men to be duly elected, made and consecrated archbishops and bishops of divers archbishoprics and bishoprics within the realm *according to such order and form and with such ceremonies in and about their consecrations, as were allowed and set forth by the said acts statutes and orders annexed to the said Book of Common Prayer before mentioned*, and further for the avoiding of all ambiguities and questions that might be objected against the lawful confirmations, investing and consecrations of the said archbishops and bishops her Highness in her *Letters Patent*, under the great seal of England, directed to any archbishop bishop or others for the confirming investing and consecrating of any person elected to the office or dignity of any archbishop, not only used such words and sentences as were accustomed to be used by the said late King Henry and King Edward—in their like patents made for such causes, *but also used and put in her majesty's said Letters Patent, divers other general words and sentences, whereby her Highness by her supreme power and authority hath dispensed with all causes*

*or doubts of any imperfection or disability* that can or may in any wise be objected against the same as by her majesty's said Letters Patent remaining of record more plainly will appear. So that all those that will consider of the effect and true intent of the said laws and statutes and of the supreme and absolute authority of the Queen's Highness and which she by her majesty's Letters Patent hath used and put in use about the making and consecrating of the said archbishops and bishops, it is and may be evident and apparent that no cause of scruple, ambiguity or doubt can or may justly be objected against the said elections, confirmations or consecrations or any other material thing meet to be used or made or had in or about the same : but that everything requisite and material for that purpose hath been made and done as precisely and with as great a care and diligence or rather more, as ever the like was done before her Majesty's time as the records of her Majesty's said father and brother's time and *also of her owne time will more plainly testifie and declare.*

Wherefore for the plain declaration of all the premisses and to the intent that the same may be better known to every of the Queen Majesty's subjects, whereby such evil speech as heretofore hath been used against the high state of prelacy may hereafter cease ; be it known and enacted by the authority of this present Parliament that the said act and statute made in the first year of the reign . . . whereby the said Book of Common Prayer and the administration of the sacraments with other rites and ceremonies is authorised and allowed to be used, shall stand and remaine good and perfect to all respects and purposes : and that such order and form for the consecrating of archbishops and bishops and for the making of priests, deacons and ministers as was set forth in the time of the said late King Edward VI shall stand and be in full force and effect and shall henceforth be used and observed in all places within this realm.

And that the acts and things heretofore had, made or done by any person or persons in or about any consecration or investing of any person or persons elected to the office or dignity of any archbishop or bishop within the realm . . . by virtue of the Queen Majesty's Letters Patent or commission since the beginning of her Majesty's reign be and shall be by authority of this present Parliament declared judged and deemed at and from every of the several times of the doing thereof, good and perfect to all respects and purposes ; any matter or thing that can or may be objected to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding.

And that all persons that have been or shall be made ordered or consecrated archbishops, bishops, priests, ministers of God's holy word and sacraments or deacons after the form and order prescribed in the said order and form how archbishops, bishops, priests, deacons and ministers should be consecrated made and ordered be in very deed and also by the authority hereof declared and enacted to be and shall be archbishops, bishops, etc., rightly made, ordered and consecrated : any statute, law, canon or other thing to the contrary notwithstanding.

Here in these passages is clear reference not only to the rite used, that of the Edwardian Ordinal of 1552, but also to the Letters Patent with the "supplentes" or dispensing clause, signifying the royal assent and mandate to confirm the election and consecrate the elect. The



very fact that the plural "archbishops" is used and that the act embraces all persons consecrated *since the beginning of the reign* suggests that Parker is included. But there is more apodictic proof that he is included, nay more, that he is the person primarily intended; for in the Letters Patent for making known the royal assent and commanding the confirmation and consecration of archbishops and bishops between the beginning of the reign and 1566, the year of this Parliament, the Letter Patent referring to his Confirmation and Consecration is the only one that has this "*supplentes*" or *dispensing clause*.<sup>1</sup> The statute, 8 Elizabeth, c. 1, therefore gives testimony that the commission of December 6th and not that of September 9th was acted upon and that the rite used was that of the Edwardian Ordinal. In a word it supports the account of Parker's consecration given in the Lambeth Register.

Mr. Whitebrook's book has certainly the merit of ingenuity; in fact it leaves the impression that the author's ingenuity has run away with him. As a piece of historical writing, it is very defective: the omission of much of the evidence that runs counter to his theory, the inaccuracies, errors of fact, strained inferences and somewhat erroneous translations preclude a more favourable judgment. There remains, however, the problem of the miscalculation of the date of consecration in the acts signed by Parker. Only a very careful investigation of the original documents, not of the printed copies, would offer a solution, if solution there be.

It may be said in conclusion that this matter of Parker's consecration, as the author rightly remarks, does not touch the question of the validity of Anglican orders, which was decided by Leo XIII according to the constant tradition of their invalidity, owing to defect of form and intention, as shown by the rite in use for a hundred years.<sup>2</sup>

L. HICKS.

<sup>1</sup> I take this assertion from Haddon, *op. cit.* III, 82, note 7; the calendar of Patent Rolls Elizabeth not extending to that year and there being no opportunity as yet of consulting the originals. Mr. Whitebrook's account of the Bonner case (pp. 98-101) is quite unsatisfactory: and his citation from the statute: "Both the present Bishops, and all such as should be hereafter confirmed are to be deemed truly and lawfully such," is altogether misleading by its omission of the word "archbishops."

<sup>2</sup> Because Leo XIII in his encyclical, *Apostolicae Curae*, prescinded from Parker's consecration, Mr. Whitebrook suggests that he thereby implied that he was consecrated by Kitchen and continues: "With such a decision the matter is ended for Roman Catholics and a refusal to consider the force of the documents that led to the prescinding from the case of Parker's consecration, would tend to precisely such a subreption, leading to the weakening of the structure of the Bull as is contemplated and forbidden by its solemn close," (p. 55). This is straying very far from the text and to be candid, is not far from nonsense. The reason why in 1704 the committee appointed to examine the case of Clement Gordon—a convert who had once been a Protestant bishop—and Leo XIII is relating this history—prescinded from Parker's consecration was because one of the reasons Gordon, in his supplication, adduced for the nullity of his orders was the Nag's Head fable of Parker's consecration: and the committee quite rightly refused to base its decision on it. This is clear from the text of the encyclical as also from the authoritative commentary of S. M. Brandi, S.J., commended by Leo XIII himself, cf. S. M. Brandi, S.J., *Rome and Canterbury*, French translation, Paris, 1898, pp. 22-23 (text of encyclical) and p. 90-94 (commentary). The matter had no reference whatever to Kitchen.

# MISCELLANEA

## I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

### SOME RECENT WORKS ON SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY<sup>1</sup>

THE Faculty of Philosophy of the Collegium Maximum of Ysleta (Mexico) has already a number of outstanding text-books to its credit. These recent additions to its *Cursus Philosophicus*—in every way worthy of their predecessors—exhibit the same sound characteristics: competent scholarship, orderly arrangement, objectivity and—a refreshing feature—attention to the historical aspects of their subjects.

Fr. Dávila's book is a veritable *multum in parvo*. Within its 300 pages he gives us a concise history of Philosophy, a treatise on the nature of Philosophy including a complete conspectus of its problems, a useful examination of the question "What is Scholastic Philosophy?" and (the second part of his book) a complete course of Formal Logic and Methodology. The incredulous will be inclined to exclaim: "It can't be done!" The surprising thing is that it *has* been done and, within the limits of an Introduction, done satisfactorily. Sketchiness has not been entirely avoided—as, for instance, in the too-brief section on the relations between Philosophy and Science. But, on the whole, the author has succeeded in keeping out of most of the traps incidental to a work of this sort: the reader is not conscious of being hurried through vast masses of congested matter nor of being set down before a thin diet of predigested invalid-food.

Fr. Dávila's historical approach marks a happy break from the bad tradition in which the beginner was offered a highly abstract definition of the nature of Philosophy and had no reason for suspecting that what purported to be a premiss was in reality a conclusion—the final result, not the starting-point, of the investigation. In consequence, Philosophy was presented as a phantom, unsubstantial sort of subject suspended in mid-air without any clearly discernible bearing on the business and interests of human life. Fr. Dávila starts by describing the sort of questions which, from the earliest times down to our own days, men have asked about the world in which they found themselves, and the variety of the answers given. Thus, the beginner comes to recognize the subject-matter of Philosophy and the type of thinking it involves. The chief merit of the historical part of Fr. Dávila's work lies not so much in its mere information as in its systematic arrangement and objectivity. Dealing with ancient and medieval Philosophy, he takes the outstanding question of a given period and groups his schools and thinkers in relation to that dominant interest.

For the moderns, such a method would be out of the question, within the set limits, so he wisely changes his plan taking, as his general points of reference, Descartes and Kant in their influence and in the reactions they provoked, but not allowing himself to be cramped by his own method. The result is a small-scale History of Philosophy, complete with orderly chronological tables, invaluable for the beginner and useful as a refresher-course for the more advanced.

<sup>1</sup> (i) *Introductio ad Philosophiam et Logica*. Auctore Iulio Dávila, S.J. Pp. 300. Price, 10.00 pesos. 1945; (ii) *Doctrina Sancti Thomae de Actu et Potentia et de Concursu*. Auctore Raphaele Martínez del Campo, S.J. Pp. 238. Price, 8.00 pesos. 1944. Both published by "Buena Prensa," Apartado 2181, Mexico, D.F.

Only when he has thus revealed the philosopher at work does he attempt to answer the questions: "What is he really doing? What sort of thinking does Philosophy involve?" Here, again, his answer is, in the first instance, historical in that men have conceived differently of the function of Philosophy at different epochs. Making due allowance for that variety of opinion, he goes on to give sound reasons for preferring, as a fruitful working definition, the historically central conception of Philosophy as the mind's natural knowledge of all things in their ultimate principles. And so, finally, on this basis of universal realism he is able to delineate the basic problems of Philosophy in all its branches, and to map systematically the field that he has already traversed historically.

Of Fr. Dávila's Logic it is only necessary to say that it is concise, workmanlike and traditional in its exposition—though here too he supplies a brief historical conspectus of his subject and notes the differences of opinion that prevail about the nature and function of Logic. The more modern aspects of the subject (Logistic and Symbolic Logic) are treated briefly and incidentally in scholia as occasion offers while on the problem of Induction Fr. Dávila contents himself with a brief statement and refers the reader to his *Crítica* (already published) for fuller treatment.

If Fr. Dávila is chiefly concerned with the questions "What is Philosophy?" and "What is Scholastic Philosophy?" his colleague attempts to answer in the first part of his work the no less controversial question "What is a Thomist?" Thomists, it would appear, are thinkers divided among themselves only by their allegiance to The Common Doctor. And the rift of opinion goes all the way down to the metaphysical basis of St. Thomas's thought. What is the genuine mind of St. Thomas on the relation between Act and Potency, the principle of limitation, the distinction between essence and existence in the finite existent?

It might be maintained that those questions have been formally and definitively settled by the "Twenty-Four Theses," the official systematization of St. Thomas's doctrine proposed by the Sacred Congregation of Studies on July 27th, 1914. From this view Fr. Martínez del Campo most emphatically dissents; he contends that they are still open questions and justifies that opinion by direct appeal to Papal documents.

Having thus established the legitimacy of the discussion, the author proceeds to his main task which is to extract from the writings of St. Thomas a sort of agreed syllabus of metaphysics which will enable the followers of St. Thomas to close their ranks and present a United Front. He comes to his task armed with erudition, candour, urbanity and an unquenchable optimism.

But, first, about these awkward "Twenty-Four Theses" which have proved such a stumbling-block for so many. Are they acceptable on their own merits as a coherent, securely grounded metaphysical system? "No!" says the author after a critical examination of the main difficulties. Is it certain that they faithfully reflect the mind of St. Thomas? Again the answer is "No!"—based this time on a detailed discussion of the relevant texts. The appeal to the history of Philosophy is equally unavailing. The author treats efficiently the history of the Real Distinction and sets forth a well-documented study of the controversies that have raged about the mind of St. Thomas. Expert opinion is divided.

Yet, the author is convinced, the genuine mind of St. Thomas on these fundamental points *must* be accessible to patient and detached investigation. Is there to be found in St. Thomas a sort of nuclear metaphysic acceptable by all Thomists not wedded to extremist "systematic" interpretations?

Fr. Martínez del Campo believes that he has found the answer in his conception of "metaphysical Thomism" which he develops in a highly-concentrated study of the manifold grounds of agreement between the followers of St. Thomas. Embedded in this common ground—a common doctrine on Universals, on the different "orders" of reality, logical, physical and metaphysical—is a common metaphysic which the author proceeds to bring to light. The basic concept in this system of ideas is that of the "objective, metaphysical distinction,"—a distinction that is neither purely logical nor fully physical. It is the distinction (on the plane of metaphysical abstraction) between the objective definition and that which lies outside the definition. Act and Potency, essence and existence are distinguished in this way and, by a detailed study of the chief passages from St. Thomas's writings bearing on the point, he claims to have proved that this is, in fact, what St. Thomas had in mind.

Whether ancient foes will be induced (as Fr. Martínez del Campo hopes) to bury their hatchets or incited by him (as may be feared) to a further grinding of axes, he has made an able contribution to Thomistic studies. Ranging over a wide philosophical field and taking in a useful discussion of the metaphysics of the Hypostatic Union, his book is one for the specialist rather than for the general student of scholastic philosophy and theology.

The second part of Fr. Martínez del Campo's book is both more restricted in scope and more polemical in tone. For several centuries philosophers and theologians have been under the impression that they were expounding St. Thomas when they taught that all creaturely activity demands—over and above God's general conservation—some sort of additional, immediate, *ad hoc* "motion" on the part of God. Domestic disagreement about the nature of that motion was as nothing compared to the fervour with which the contestants appealed to St. Thomas. Then, in 1923, Dr. Johann Stufler, S.J., of the University of Innsbruck wrote his *De Deo Operante*. With a wealth of reference to St. Thomas, he developed the thesis (briefly outlined by Fr. Thomas Papagni, O.P., in 1902) that, in the view of St. Thomas, nothing more was required than the dependence of "secondary causes" (truly active at their own level of being) upon God as the immanent Conserver of all things in being and the First Mover of all their activities. There was no warrant in the teaching of St. Thomas for the type of extra, complementary "motion" that was current in the modern schools. It looked very much as though Dr. Stufler had quietly kidnapped the referee.

Naturally, this novel interpretation of St. Thomas was not allowed to pass unanswered and Fr. Martínez del Campo is the latest to take up the challenge. He is at great pains to show that St. Thomas taught an *immediate* intervention on the part of God. In this he is successful but the point does not tell quite so heavily against Dr. Stufler as he thinks. It simply convicts Dr. Stufler—as others have done before him—of a confusing and misleading use of the words "mediate" and "immediate" but leaves his main position intact. But when he adduces evidence that Dr. Stufler has fastened on St. Thomas the doctrine held later by Durandus, that St. Thomas deliberately rejected that doctrine in advance and was afterwards attacked by Durandus for rejecting it—here he really does touch the nerve of the opposing thesis. However, we have no doubt at all that Dr. Stufler—never slow in counter-attack—has still some useful shots in his locker and we hope that he will sally forth from his honoured retirement to fire them.

In view of the manifold merits displayed by these volumes both in form and substance it is doubly regrettable that they should be disfigured by so many misprints.

W. D.



## II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES

- ANGLO-POLISH CATHOLIC BULLETIN** : Spring, 1946. **The Church in Modern Scotland**, by Rev. David McRoberts. [A study of the fall and resurrection of the Catholic faith in Scotland, with comments upon the effect of the Education Act of 1918, and the decline of religion in Scotland outside the Catholic fold.]
- CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW** : January, 1946. **Some Newman Letters from the Baltimore Cathedral Archives**. [An American contribution to the Newman centenary, in the form of letters, written by Newman to Dr. Kenrick, Archbishop of Baltimore, dated variously from 1852 to 1860, with one letter to Dr. Bayley, Bishop of Newark, and dated 1867.]
- CONTEXT** : March, 1946. The first number of an English Catholic Digest, slight in format but promising fuller development when conditions make that possible. The number includes "condensations" from Catholic reviews and weeklies, in the Digest manner.
- ETUDES** : February, 1946. **Responsabilité Collective Allemande**, by Comte Robert d'Harcourt, of the French Academy. [An illuminating study of German reactions to the questions of war guilt and responsibility, with some words of counsel to the Allied Control Commission.]
- GREGORIANUM** : 1945. **Studia Tridentina**. The text of public conferences, delivered at the Gregorian University, Rome, to commemorate the fourth centenary of the opening of the Council of Trent. They include addresses on Pope Paul III, the significance of Trent in the Church's history, the character of its reform and its influence on art, as also upon the actuality of the Council for to-day.
- MERCURIO PERUANO** : November and December, 1945. Two numbers of a South American review, devoted to social science and to literature. These include articles in commemoration of Andrés Avelino Aramburú and on the questions of Freedom of Speech and international solidarity in Latin America.
- MISSIONAIRES** : January, 1946. **Terre et Gens d'Indochine**. [A charming and artistic production, with delightful illustrations, showing the life and mentality of the people of Indo-China and recording the progress of Catholic missionary work.]
- MISSIONARY SERVANT** : January and February, 1946. Two numbers of a neat American monthly, published by the Missionary Servants of the Most Holy Trinity, with articles on Japan and South America.
- NOUVELLE REVUE THEOLOGIQUE** : January, 1946. **L'Eglise, Nouvelle Eve, Née du Sacré-Coeur**, by G. de Broglie, S.J. [A profound address, originally given during the National Congress of the Sacred Heart, at Montmartre, in June, 1945, and showing the relation between the Sacred Heart of Our Lord and the Church.]
- SHIELD** : January and February, 1946. A hearty welcome to this Catholic periodical, the first ever issued in Southern Rhodesia. It has articles of general import and local interest, with a blend of the earnest and the gay. Good wishes for its success, to Bishop Chichester, S.J., who is its founder.
- SWORD** : March, 1946. **U.N.O Spells Vodka**, by A. C. F. Beales. [Has some sound and timely observations upon the need for "obligations" in international affairs, and not merely "bargains," coupled with an appeal for Catholic interest in U.N.O.]

# REVIEWS

## IN ROME UNDER GERMAN OCCUPATION<sup>1</sup>

**S**URELY one of the brightest and freshest books that have come out of Hitler's Europe! Not that its tone is flippant or lacking the genuine undertones of mankind in sore distress. It is a diary, kept by an American religious in Rome, of day-to-day events and impressions, with their constantly-changing hopes and apprehensions. Its span is that of the Nazi occupation of the Eternal City, from early September, 1943, up to the arrival of Allied troops, in June, 1944. The manuscript was taken from Rome to Spain by a British officer (it was dedicated to Mrs. Carlton Hayes, wife of the American Ambassador in Madrid), and the Ambassador himself saw to its transference to the U.S.A. and to its publication by the Macmillan Company in New York.

The book provides us with a vivid picture of what happened in Rome and around Rome during those fateful nine months, and with a most understanding account of the reactions of the ordinary Italian folk. The Nazis secured control of the city by capturing the secret code of the Italian General Staff and thus, by contradictory orders, throwing Italian regiments into confusion. Not that this was accepted mildly! The writer records how, in the first weeks of occupation, the night fell softly—a peaceful prelude to shooting and pitched battles in the streets. Throughout the book are tales of bomb outrages against the Nazis, the most serious of them that bomb explosion in a dustman's cart in the Via Rasella, which led to the execution of 320 Italian prisoners from the Roman prison of "Regina Coeli."

We learn also that bomb damage in and near Rome was far more extensive than we had thought. On September 8th, there is mention of the air-raid on Frascati, then the headquarters of Kesselring. "Dear, ancient, crowded, noisy, gay little Frascati"—that is how the authoress speaks of it; a thousand Italians were killed, together with 150 Germans. The railway tracks encircling Rome to the East and South-East were frequently attacked, as they ran through the various goods-stations of Tiburtina, San Lorenzo, Tusculana, Ostiense and Trastevere, and great damage was caused. On February 17th, 1944, an entry records that bombs fell near the Porta San Paolo, "ripping up" the graves of the English poets, Keats and Shelley, in the English Protestant cemetery, just inside that particular Roman gate.

There are lighter moments, such as that noted for September 20th, when German sentinels in the neighbourhood of the German Embassy had been ordered to observe exceptional precautions:

Last night, one of the German sentries in the street saw figures beckoning to one another on an adjacent roof. Outlined against the sky, they presented an easy target. He fired, with no result. He fired again. A platoon rushed to the spot and identified the beckoning men as the stone statues of the Twelve Apostles which surmount the façade of St. John Lateran.

Those who know their Rome will appreciate this incident.

<sup>1</sup> *Inside Rome with the Germans.* By Jane Scrivener. New York: Macmillan. Pp. xi, 204. Price, \$2.50. 1945.

From her own experience, the authoress tells us of the burying of convent treasure in their garden (and what a problem it was to recover it?). She was in personal touch with British prisoners of war. On January 8th, she notes that 400 of them were being lodged and looked after in the city, each of whom received 100 Italian lire a day from an underground fund. Later entries mention an increasing number of such unofficial guests. British prisoners might be paraded from time to time along the Via del Impero, to impress the people of Rome with German might. They were dirty and battle-stained, especially after the Anzio landings, but always were they cheerful. On March 9th, she tells the story of one British officer, free in Rome, who spoke both German and Italian, and went about in clerical dress. One day, he was crossing the Piazza San Pietro, outside St. Peter's, when a German soldier accosted him and asked how he might get to St. Peter's. The officer told him he would be delighted to show him round the cathedral, and did so for the greater part of the morning. They parted on the best of terms, and the German was most profuse in his thanks. The diarist speaks of a regular service between Rome and the Campagna, where many escaped Allied prisoners were hiding; the peasants had built huts for them in the woods and warned them of any approach of danger; Italian officers ran this assistance-service of food, clothes and books.

The reaction of the Italian people is registered, subtly and sensitively, by one who for long years has lived among them. There were the obvious food problems, with entries such as: "No milk for ten days." To start with, hopes soared very high; then came the inevitable disappointment. Rome was indeed a listening-post. With, almost literally, one ear to the ground, the Romans listened for the awaited advance of the Allies. Later, after the landing at Anzio, they quite literally listened, hearing the rumble of guns and bombs in the distance. On November 6th, the diary records the bombing of Vatican territory, with very detailed information about the damage done. It adds that the people attributed this to a German plane, flown by the secretary of Farinacci, one of the most violent of Mussolini's neo-Fascists. In February, 1944, she speaks of the solitary plane which flew low over Rome every evening and circled round the Vatican City. Once again, the people said it belonged to the Farinacci faction; it was called "the phantom ship" or *Il Romanino*.

All through the book one is conscious of the efforts of the Pope to relieve distress and to succour the people of Rome. The measure of his success was extraordinary, and it was obvious that the Germans had so many enemies that they provoked the Holy Father as little as possible. When sirens sounded, very many thousands took refuge in the open place in front of St. Peter's, confident that the Allies would respect the territory of the Pope. And in every conceivable manner, Vatican parties scoured the countryside to provide food and resources for a nearly starving population. German convoys attached themselves to those of the Vatican, hoping thereby to secure immunity, with the result that, on occasions, Vatican lorries were attacked and destroyed. Those Englishmen who have drunk deep of the muddy waters of cheap -isms and imagine that the Holy Father had any sympathy with the Nazi occupiers of his centuries-old city, will have many salutary surprises, if they can bring themselves to read this book. In a foreword, Dr. Carlton Hayes, till recently U.S. Ambassador in Madrid, writes thus:

Appropriately depicted, too, is the role of the Pope and the Vatican as Rome's bulwarks during the whole trying time. The Vatican found

food for the starving. It eased physical and spiritual hardships. It guarded treasures of literature and art. Pope Pius XII stood forth against the Nazis as, centuries earlier, Pope Leo I had stood forth—and saved Rome—against Attila and the Huns.

Then, in the closing days of May, 1944, liberation came near. From day to day the capture is recorded of this or the other village among the Alban Hills; events are followed with breath-taking attention. Dusk fell on June 4th. At ten o'clock at night there were loud cries of "Viva Savoia. Viva gli Alleati." All at once the electric light was turned on; light flashed out from uncurtained windows; then all was dark once more. Next morning, the diarist peeped out from her window, at 6 a.m. One small jeep was advancing cheekily, with four of her fellow citizens inside. Later that day, the Via Veneto was gay with bunting and with British and American flags. Two long lines of American infantry marched up either side of the roadway towards Porta Pinciana. They were dusty, unshaven and battle-worn, but they smiled and waved in answer to the frantic cheering and greetings of the Roman crowd. There were roses in the muzzles of the rifles, and roses amid the net-camouflage of their helmets. Once more—almost a mere incident in her millennia of world history—Rome was herself, freed from another enemy, driven from her gates.

All who know Rome will enjoy this book immensely. May it soon be published here in Britain! Indeed, I have written to Macmillan's to ask if this is possible. The book has one short-coming, which, I trust, an English edition will remedy. A sketch map of Rome should be included, and on it must be marked the various streets and houses that figure prominently in its lively and indeed fascinating story.

J. M.

#### SCIENCE AS IT IS, AND AS IT MIGHT BE<sup>1</sup>

IT is a happy coincidence that these two books should appear in the centenary year of Newman's "Development of Christian Doctrine." For the first of Dr. Taylor's books sets out to describe the growth of Science through the centuries and the second is a vital complement, attempting as it does to give clearly and judiciously the relations between Science and Religion. However, the parallel must not be drawn too close, seeing that Dr. Taylor's conversion preceded the writing and was not a consequence.

It is to be said at once that his readers—one hopes these will include not only those at school but also the grown-ups—will benefit by the prolonged meditation the author has evidently given to his work. The result is truly universal, neither above the beginner nor too puerile for the advanced. His skill in conveying the genuine content and spirit of Science and at the same time of steering clear of mystification is very evident, and one cannot be too grateful for the maturity shown.

"Science Past and Present" does succeed in presenting the subject in a way which would appeal to Newman, namely, as a living and growing idea. And this, not so much by dwelling on the achievements—such as X-rays or what-not—as on the mentality through which such facts came to

<sup>1</sup> (1) *Science Past and Present*. By F. Sherwood Taylor, M.A., Ph.D. London: Heinemann. Pp. 250. Price, 8s.6d. n. 1945. (2) *The Fourfold Vision; A Study of the Relations of Science and Religion*. By the same author. London: Chapman and Hall. Pp. 150. Price, 6s. n. 1945.



be. The author's method in each chapter is to prepare the reader's mind for the extracts given at the end of each chapter, so that it is possible for all to live again and experience some of the thrill of the discoverer. Further still, his choice of quotations is admirable. They are gems complete in themselves, and his skill in helping the reader to appreciate them at their proper worth shows how long and how caressingly he has pondered his documents. Added to all this are the various diagrammatic charts which help not a little in acquiring a synoptic view without which it is easy to miss the wood for the trees. And his generosity in spreading the best feast before us is shown by his choice of plates; Plates III and IV, for example, are a joy which the reader should not pass over lightly. Sometimes the author goes a little outside his theme. In the chapter "The Age of Steam" he gives extracts concerning child labour in the woollen mills and in the mines about 1832, which raise a problem that is not of its nature scientific. Yet it was wise to put the problem before the mind, if only to make readers realise that Science is not enough.

The last two chapters describe the nature of Science and its functions. The summing up is admirably done, and yet it ends on a pessimistic note. To correct this, the second book must be taken as a companion. Its theme centres round a quotation from Blake :—

Now I a four-fold vision see  
And a four-fold vision is given to me.

However, the author's main objective is to prove that when Science attempts to be totalitarian, it is inevitable that the result will be disastrous, not because the scientific vision is wrong, but because it needs the complementary vision provided principally by philosophy and religion.

May God us keep  
From single vision and Newton's sleep.

His attempt to carry conviction is sincere. Indeed some passages rise to great heights and describe personal experiences, which come near to parallels in Newman. Yet the reviewer would like more and particularly on two points. On p. 37 it is said that "no law of science can be more than provisional." This is true, but it is difficult to extract from the chapter an accurate idea of the certainty of Science, and it may be that the reader who does not follow the argument closely is left with the impression that all Science is merely probable. On p. 74 there is the statement: "Judgments of value are in fact the data employed in most decisions of human life, and there is no reason to exclude them from this most important of investigations." Granting this where action must be taken, it still remains doubtful whether it is required when proving the existence of God. Indeed, most philosophers would agree that such a judgment of value is not needed. What is required is a mental headache, of the same type as that needed when, e.g., the mathematician tackles for the first time the mysteries of Rilmennian geometry or of matrix algebra. This said, it remains that the book is one which is most fitting for the times and one can only hope that it will be read by everyone. For it does give a vision in which science and philosophy and poetry and even mysticism appear as parts of a single whole, which in the end is what "everyman" desires and needs.

C. W. O'HARA.

A CHRISTIAN REVIVAL IN FRANCE<sup>1</sup>

THE preface of Fr. Riquet's book, dated 25th of August, 1945, was written at Beaumont where he was a guest lecturer of the Newman Society. While his audience was deeply impressed by the stark horrors of Dachau which he had endured, they were even more amazed at the effect produced on him and on so many of his fellow-prisoners. These men, hideously humiliated, tortured and starved, had preserved their sense of human values and dignity, and had never allowed the spirit of vengeance to take any hold on them. Perhaps some explanation of this great-heartedness may be found in the *Civisme du Chrétien de France*. The book falls into two parts of which the first is an illustration of Mr. Belloc's thesis "Europe and the Faith," and the second outlines the duties and achievements of the Christian citizen of France. The medical students of the *Conférence Laennec* had first asked their chaplain, Fr. Riquet, for the earlier conferences; but it was a much more mixed public which crowded St. Séverin in 1941-42 to hear them.

A first paragraph of quiet disarming humour answers by implication the educators and theorists who deny the right to teach children any definite morality or religion. Then on a broad canvas, but with a sure touch, Fr. Riquet sketches the story of France from the days of pre-history to the crusades. The pathetic textbooks on French culture produced by scholars of the *République des Copains*, and so often used in English and American schools and colleges, stand out for the poor garbled and gaunt things which they are when set alongside Fr. Riquet's book. Unfortunately these handbooks find a place even in the libraries of Sixth Forms of some Catholic schools. Fr. Riquet quotes his authorities accurately; their names—or some of them—will suffice, Camille Jullian, Emile Male, Etienne Gilson, Augustin Fliche. Not only is Mr. Belloc's "Europe and the Faith" now adequately illustrated with names great and small, Hilary of Poitiers, Martin of Tours, Alcuin from York, St. Avit, St. Aignan, St. Ouen and a host of others; but sketches of the schools of Toulouse, Bordeaux and Autun with glimpses of the abbeys of Jumièges, Saint-Riquier, Malmédy where medicine and science were studied alongside philosophy and theology, all give Fr. Riquet's book a charm and value quite its own. It is inevitable that attention should be drawn to the chapter on *Humanisme, Fleur du Cloître*, with its long but fine quotation from J. S. Brewer which sets out in sparkling detail the civilising influence of the monastery in the world about it. Nor is the discreet scholarship which serves as a complement to "Europe and the Faith" the only link with Mr. Belloc's writing. This master stylist would relish Fr. Riquet's incantations on French wines, on the French breeds of horses, on the trees of France; they recall several passages in the "Path to Rome."

The latter half of *Civisme du Chrétien de France* gives not only principles, but applications of principles. St. Thomas Aquinas may be quoted on the same page as the latest Papal encyclical, but a page or so later a comparison is made between the attitudes of French Catholics and British or American Catholics towards their national political parties. We learn something of the work done by the J.O.C. which had 120 sections actively working among the French factory hands who were deported for slave labour in German war industry. There is pathos in the fact that so many of these later chapters represent talks given to groups of French internees at Dachau;

<sup>1</sup> *Civisme du Chrétien de France*. By Michel Riquet, S.J. Paris: Aux Etudiants de France Pp. 288. Price, 95 francs. 1945.

they would gather discreetly after the day's toil to listen to Fr. Riquet who was one of themselves. He dedicates the book to five men, the first of whom is General Delestraint, the first commander-in-chief of the F.F.I. This officer listened to many of these conferences, but wore the unaccustomed garb of a Dachau convict; he was executed by his captors only in April last.

It would ill become an Englishman to praise the style of the book, but he may be allowed to say that anyone who reads it, still more anyone who listened to Fr. Riquet's conferences at the Pax Romana Congress last summer, will feel little surprise at hearing the news that Fr. Riquet was appointed to preach the sermons at Notre Dame this Lent.

R. C. G.

---

"FIRST PETER"<sup>1</sup>

IT is a pleasure to see the great series of commentaries continued which (as we are told) began with the publication of Bishop Lightfoot's *Galatians* in 1865. The series has been conspicuous for serious and objective scholarship, and although it has not been possible for Catholics to agree with all the views put forward, still it commands our sympathy as probably having done much in a quiet way to hinder the advanced rationalism of many foreign students from sweeping the board in this country. The present work maintains the high standard of sane and unbiased evaluation of the evidence.

The general get-up is excellent, and the price for so much difficult printing is very moderate. Still, it may be worth while to offer a criticism upon the arrangement, especially in view of a hope for further volumes. The Greek text receives such a full exegesis that sometimes the "footnotes" leave only one line of text at the top of the page, and sometimes not even that. Hence it is practically impossible to hunt up the various references to the text, or to get a connected view of it as a whole. The epistle itself is so short that it would be only a slight addition to print it separately by itself; indeed, it might be easier and simpler not to print these fragments of text over the commentary at all. Better still, if the text were printed separately, an English translation might be put alongside of it, not the Authorized Version, which is a familiar classic but not critical, but rather a translation serving to bring out the sense, not designed to be a literary masterpiece, but either a very literal version or a paraphrase. A translation is the best possible commentary upon a text, and saves much explanation.

As a matter of fact, the Editor's translations in his notes are not always quite convincing; in I Pet. iv. 14, for example, he renders, "The Presence of the Glory, yea the Spirit of God, rests upon you," which seems hazardous. The Authorized Version in this case is more likely to be correct: "the spirit of glory, and of God resteth upon you": though "spirit" might well have had a capital. It might also have been worth while to mention the well-supported addition, "and of power," after "glory." The Editor follows in the main Dr. Souter's text in his edition of 1910, which is a good one, but even so in such a massive edition as this we expect some comments upon the variant readings. Thus, in I Pet. v. 2, the verb which he translates in the note, "exercising your pastoral care" is a questionable reading, being omitted by the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts, with some other support; in the Westminster Version it has been thought better to omit it, but in any

<sup>1</sup> *The First Epistle of St. Peter.* The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Essays. By Edward Gordon Selwyn, D.D., Dean of Winchester. London: Macmillan. Pp. xvi, 517. Price, 25s. n. 1946.

case the student should be given a warning of the uncertainty, all the more so because, as Dr. Selwyn remarks in the note, "Only here in the New Testament is the verb used in this sense."

If there be some weakness in this direction, the work has also strong points to compensate for it. The Greek of the epistle is carefully analysed and amply illustrated; it is in this way perhaps that the work makes its best and greatest contribution to the elucidation of the epistle. Any chance page is enough to show how completely the Editor is at home in the language, a treat rather too rare in these somewhat anti-Greek days; those who are not fairly familiar with Greek are not likely to find the book of much use, but evidently they cannot advance far in any case in New Testament scholarship, which in general (though hardly in this particular case) is seen more clearly than ever nowadays to demand Hebrew and Aramaic as well.

The theology of the epistle also receives adequate treatment, without any desire either to exaggerate or minimize. Whether the epistle was written from Rome or not is primarily a historical point, but is so well recognized to have theological bearings that it is worth while to notice that Dr. Selwyn has no doubt—for indeed it is the only reasonable conclusion—that the right answer is in the affirmative (pp. 60, 243, 303-5). In the same way, in his discussion of the Church in the Introduction (p. 82), he accepts the view that "we must say of St. Peter that he teaches the doctrine expressed later in the phrase, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*." The type of the Ark, recognized as such (iii. 20-21), more especially points to this. The whole section is a competent piece of biblical theology, keeping well within the bounds of the epistle. And so of some other points.

An interesting and important feature is to be found in the table of parallels with other New Testament passages in the long second essay. This may well be thought an example of "form-criticism" at its best. Dr. Selwyn does not postulate written documents, but rather topics which were likely to appear in the current teaching. He follows Dr. Bigg in finding "intimate links" binding together this epistle and Hebrews (p. 466), and (here and in some other respects) is inclined to trace the influence of Silvanus (Silas).

C. L.

#### CARDINAL NEWMAN IN PERSPECTIVE <sup>1</sup>

THE very successful conference which was held at Beaumont College last summer to mark the centenary of John Henry Newman's reception into the One True Fold proved among other things that many of the younger generation, notably university men and women, recognize the debt they owe to the author of the *Apologia*, the *Idea of a University* and the *Grammar of Assent*. But while a great number had perused these classics, many were hampered in their reading for lack of a sufficient familiarity with the religious background of the author's life. This handicap was in part due to the difficulties of wartime publishing, but for which a whole series of books would have heralded the centenary; yet it would not have arisen if a brief historical introduction were to be found in each volume, as has been suggested for all new editions.

Meanwhile two books which have appeared somewhat belatedly will go far to supply this deficiency. Their very lateness is opportune since it will

<sup>1</sup> (1) *John Henry Newman*. By John Moody. London: Sheed and Ward. Pp. 274. Price, 15s. n. 1945. (2) *John Henry Newman: Centenary Essays*. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne. Pp. 242. Price, 10s. 6d. n. 1945.



help to correct the inevitably fragmentary impressions culled from lectures, sermons, and ephemeral reading. The first will prove most helpful to the general reader, the second to the more advanced, who wishes to pursue particular aspects of the great Oratorian's manifold achievement. Together they largely make up for the difficulty, felt by all who are not within reach of a good library, of securing any of his works.

Mr. Moody, writing originally for an American public, has set himself the task of producing "a popular readable narrative of Cardinal Newman and his times, giving equal attention to both his Anglican and his Catholic careers." His unquestionable success may be ascribed to the fact that he views his subject from the vantage point of a geographical as well as a historical distance, or more probably to his having followed something of the same course in his religious development, for he is a convert who found his way from the Low to the High Church position in the Episcopalian Church before being received into the Catholic Church some fifteen years ago.

There is no new matter but an easy mastery of detail which has no difficulty in demonstrating the spiritual pre-eminence of the Cardinal over his contemporaries. This is conveyed by a judicious selection from the ample and crowded Oxford life, still relatively unexplored by Catholics, of incidents and interests which throw light upon events in the second forty-five years of his long life. Mr. Moody has also been careful to let Newman speak and write whenever possible and this method forcibly indicates the homogeneity of thought and teaching. But the reader who is unfamiliar with the Victorian scene will be most grateful for the brief sketches of friends and contemporaries which enable him to see the Cardinal in true perspective. One question however deserves ampler treatment in view of recent studies, that of education. Neither the scale of the achievement in Dublin nor the originality of the Oratory School are given their due in an otherwise well-balanced study which will probably become the standard short life, for it cannot be bettered as a clear and succinct introduction to Newman and his age.

In the years before the war it was evident that more advanced studies were being pursued among Continental scholars than in England. From France, from Germany, from Rome there flowed an impressive series of books, outstanding among which was the synthesis made by Fr. Erich Przywara, S.J. Scholars from all nations drew upon the hospitality and generosity of the Birmingham Oratory Fathers who gave them the freedom of the Newman archives. By contrast there was very little work of a similar order being done in England. For this reason we welcome the second volume which we trust will prove to be the first of a long series.

All students of Newman will treasure the *Centenary Essays* if only because half of them are from the pens of his sons. It is no disparagement to the distinguished contributions made by Mr. Woodruff, Mr. Hollis, and Dr. Gwynn to suggest that it is the more specialized papers which will ensure a permanent interest for this *oeuvre de circonstance*; they will as unquestionably outlive the occasion of its publication as they will set the standard for future volumes.

Pride of place must be given to Father Henry Tristram's "With Newman at Prayer," which brings out the gift he shared with the saints of kindling in others the sense of God's nearness. Next in interest we would place Father Vincent Reade's deservedly trenchant critique of the "Sentimental Myth," but it is left to Dr. H. F. Davis of Oscott to indicate in a masterly

fashion the lasting values of Newman's teaching and to point out their relevance to the present age. The true stature of the Cardinal is made clearer by this brief study than by many of his biographies and it should do much to give spur to a new era of Newman studies in English.

This new era will be considerably assisted by the invaluable bibliographical pages "On Reading Newman," into which Father Tristram has distilled the fruit of a lifetime's devotion to the vast literature that is the best guarantee of Newman's power to lead modern man *ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem*.

HERBERT KELDANY.

### THE NEW TESTAMENT

TRANSLATED BY MGR. KNOX<sup>1</sup>

THE Rheims New Testament was first published in 1582, and together with the Douay Old Testament came to form the Douay Version. Much good work has been done by Father Hugh Pope upon the Rheims New Testament in his *Student's Aids* and elsewhere, and he has made clear, for example, the (unacknowledged) debt to it of the Authorized Version (1611). Still, it was no small misfortune that the main style was so Latin as to lend itself to ridicule, and that some of the words used were decidedly queer. If only the translators had embarked upon their enterprise with something of the spirit of Mgr. Knox, it would probably have made a considerable difference in the position of the Church in these islands. The difficulty was realized by Bishop Challoner, who (somewhat after the manner of Pope Sixtus V in dealing with the Latin Vulgate) displayed more zeal than prudence in grappling with the problem. He trusted too much to the Authorized Version for his improvements, and brought out no less than six revisions of the Rheims New Testament, thus leaving the text in some confusion.

The Catholic Biblical Association of America has now brought out what appears to be in every way the best revision so far of the Rheims New Testament, a task for which they had hoped at one time to secure Mgr. Knox's help. It is much to be desired that they should revise the Douay Old Testament in the same way; but at present they are translating the Old Testament from the Hebrew itself. Meanwhile Mgr. Knox has published a very successful translation of the Latin New Testament, entirely his own original work. The first large edition was sold through the Catholic press in 1944; the second now appears as "authorized by the Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales," with a commendatory preface by His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. Being made from the Latin Vulgate, which is the only fully official Bible in the Latin rite, it may be used for public reading in church, though the Douay Version also remains permitted. It may be noted that it is not lawful to use the Westminster Version in this way, since it is not based upon the Vulgate, but upon the original texts; nor have the Editors ever desired or contemplated such a use. Still, it may be as well to warn students of Holy Writ that for purposes of serious study a translation based on the inspired text itself is essential.

Mgr. Knox's New Testament—we may well say, of course—restores the arrangement of the text in paragraphs; perhaps the most unfortunate infiltration from the Authorized Version was the division of the text into numbered verses, each in itself a separate paragraph. This of itself was

<sup>1</sup> *The Knox New Testament*. London: Burns and Oates. Pp. xiv, 605. Price, 6s. and 10s. 6d. n. 1945.

enough to make St. Paul almost unintelligible. The paper of the first edition was good, that of the second edition can only be called bad, being both too yellow and too transparent ; but paper in these days is no small difficulty, and doubtless this defect will be remedied in future editions. Already some improvements have been made in the work, and it may be hoped that in course of time others will follow, but always as a result of care and consideration, without repeating the unfortunate history of the Rheims Testament.

That the improvement made by the new edition upon this latter is enormous goes without saying. The chief sins of Rheims are in its English, and Mgr. Knox has used all his skill to produce a version at once clear and literary. There is no need to multiply examples, where the fact is obvious at every turn. To take one striking example. In II Cor. i, 20, the Rheims version reads : "For all the promises of God are in him, *it is* ; therefore also by him, amen to God, unto our glory." This now becomes : "In him all the promises of God become certain ; that is why, when we give glory to God, it is through him that we say our Amen." In refusing "our glory," Mgr. Knox is translating the Greek rather than the Latin, and the sense seems to be that the promises are fulfilled, rather than become certain ; but it is a relief to find a good and clear meaning in place of something approaching to nonsense.

It is difficult for any translator to lose himself entirely in the thought and expression of the sacred writers ; and perhaps rather more difficult for one with the vivid thought and personality of the translator here in question. The style is almost inevitably very much his own ; and the modern literary style has not so much dignity as that of a population brought up on the Bible, like the New Testament Jews or the more biblical generations of the past in our own country. It is this that seems to be the trouble when, for example, a "thou" rather jars upon us, as being out of harmony with the now rather more colloquial text. The style of this particular translation may demand its disappearance, regrettable though the loss would be on other grounds.

Such need of improvement as there seems to be is mainly to be found in the Pauline epistles, as is almost inevitably the case, since they present the most difficult problems. The need, such as it is, embraces both text and notes. To take the latter first. "All those who from the first were known to him, he has destined from the first to be moulded into the image of his Son . . . So predestined, he called them ; so called, he justified them ; so justified, he glorified them." (Rom. viii, 29-30.) The text goes on to ask, "When that is said, what follows ?" The reader may be excused for answering, "It follows that everyone whom God has ever known will be saved"—a very welcome conclusion even to some pious Catholics ! There is no relevant comment whatever in the notes. As a matter of fact, even in the translation the use of the English aorist does not seem accurate ; there is no question merely of events in the past. And in that rather terrible passage, Rom. ix, 22-24, where the rendering is "fit *only* for destruction," the word "only" is not in the Latin or Greek, and has hardly more justification than Luther serving "by faith alone" in Rom. iii, 28. Here again there is no note to save the situation. In translating and explaining Romans, one is in a rather real sense playing with fire, though outside the Church the interest in the fire has much decreased.

Many other passages of course invite remark, but there is only space wherein to mention a very few. Nor is it the purpose to condemn, but only to plead that the present edition should not be final. No translation or

commentary can ever do full justice to the New Testament, which we can comprehend only in part, even in the Greek ; but the present volume has made a notable contribution to the English effort. It has our best wishes *ad multos annos*, and the translator likewise.

C. L.

## SHORT NOTICES

### HISTORICAL

Our English martyrs are all too little known and appreciated here in England. This fact has prompted Father George Burns, S.J., to write **Gibbets and Gallows** (B.O. and W. : 5s. n.), under which gory titlepiece we are given not merely a short account of the life of Blessed Edmund Arrowsmith, but the story also of the persecutions and martyrdoms from the Lancashire point of view. For Father Burns writes in Lancashire and about Lancashire men and women, and there is plenty local colour. His style is swift and episodic, and somewhat jerky—an impression enhanced by the absence of chapter divisions : the text is divided by sectional headings which do not allow repose enough for eye and mind. To begin, we have a sketch of Blessed Edmund's surroundings. There are glimpses of his valiant grandfather, who died imprisoned for the faith, and of his kinsman, Father John Gerard, whose examination by torture and subsequent escape from the Tower of London are vividly described. Born in 1585, Edmund Arrowsmith went to Douai in 1613 and joined the Society of Jesus ten years later, the year in which the English province of the Society came first into existence. At that time, 120 members of the order were working in England, and as many were studying or working abroad. The account of the arrest and trial of Father Arrowsmith is admirably done. This is a short, bright and readable book ; and, though not a boys' book in the technical sense, it should be a welcome addition to all youth libraries.

### PRESENT DAY PROBLEMS

In **Eastern Catholics under Soviet Rule**, published jointly by the *Tablet* and the *Sword of the Spirit* at one shilling and sixpence, Michael Derrick has provided a clear, careful and cogent account of the Soviet persecution of Ruthenian Catholics. Since the Russians gained possession of all Polish territory to the East of the Curzon Line—one of the sorry legacies of Yalta—a cruel persecution has developed. The number of Catholics to the East of the Curzon Line is three and a half millions, and a further million of Ruthenian Catholics live in territory which the Russians have acquired from Czechoslovakia and Roumania. Nor was the Curzon Line always an effective barrier against this persecution ; for the Ruthenian bishop of Przemyśl, and his auxiliary bishop, were arrested West of that line and taken to prison in Russia, and half a million Ukrainians are being forcibly driven Eastward from present-day Poland. Mr. Derrick gives the history of the reconciliation, towards the close of the sixteenth century, of these Ruthenians with the Holy See, which culminated in the official union at Brest-Litovsk (1595), and he shows how they remained loyal to the Catholic faith, despite oppression and penal legislation under the Czars. He also tells of the experiences of the Ruthenian Catholics : under the first Soviet occupation, from September, 1939, to September, 1941 ; under the occupation by the Germans, from summer, 1941, to summer, 1944 ; and finally, under Soviet



occupation, from summer, 1944, till to-day. On December 23rd, 1945, Pope Pius XII issued an encyclical, *Orientales Omnes Ecclesias*, which denounced the Soviet persecution and explicitly stated that the Patriarch of Moscow was privy to this Soviet attempt to make Catholics repudiate their beliefs and their allegiance. Mr. Derrick reminds us that four Ruthenian archbishops and bishops have already died in prison, that the machinery of the Ruthenian Church has been broken to pieces, but that, in spite of pressure of the most violent kind, only 42 out of 2,700 Ruthenian priests have declared themselves ready to support the so-called "Committee of Initiative," headed by an apostate priest. In an appendix, we are given the full texts of the Moscow Patriarch's appeal to apostacy, addressed to the Ruthenians; the proclamation of Dr. Kostelnyk, the leader of the "Committee of Initiative"; and Dr. Kostelnyk's formal application for the favour and patronage of the Ukrainian Soviet. The more recent declaration that Ruthenian Catholics have gone over to the Orthodox Church is a piece of chicanery, on a par with the persecution. All archbishops and bishops of the Ruthenian Catholic Church have been imprisoned; four have died in captivity; the only voice which is permitted utterance is that of the handful of renegade priests and Soviet officials that constitute the "Committee of Initiative." Mr. Derrick's pamphlet is a most convincing and well-documented exposé of Soviet persecution of Ruthenian Catholics for the sake of their Catholic faith.

## VERSE

In a foreword to this small volume—**Cross and Shrine** (Sands: 4s. 6d. n.)—Herbert Palmer states that the authoress, Mary Winter Were, belongs to the "permanent company of post-Caroline Christian poets, which include Cowper and Charles Wesley and Francis Ridley Hevergal at one end, and Christina Rossetti and Coventry Patmore and Francis Thompson at the other." He adds that "critics and anthologists of religious verse will be at fault if they overlook her." Miss Winter Were has contributed many a poem to *THE MONTH* so that we naturally welcome this tribute to her poetic qualities. Her verse is marked by simplicity and musical rhythm. It has a light and delicate touch, and is haunted by the quiet colouring of white and green and blue. It evokes bright pictures and glimpses of natural beauty. Herbert Palmer speaks of exquisite stanzas like the following:

What are the thoughts and what the dreams  
She weaves into her tapestries  
Of little blue and silver streams  
And quiet little nunneries?

A first section, "In Time of War," reveals a sense of stress and strain. A second takes us backwards "Across Two Thousand Years," and there the poetess is most at home, amid the mysteries of Christ's life. A breath of genuine devotion blows through these poems, some of which have the lilt and spontaneity of Christmas carols.

## BIOGRAPHICAL

A delightful booklet is **Three Saints for the Incredulous** (Fordham University Press, New York: 60 cents). It is reminiscent of Mgr. Benson's "Alphabet of Saints," both in its excellent paper and in its printing; but far removed from the older book by its type of humour. The story of the "Three Hermits of Ireland," deftly slipped into the life of St. Paul, the

First Hermit, recalls perhaps one of the best cartoons that has appeared in *Punch* during the last thirty years. Father Holland opens with a brief discussion of the Incredulous, following it with a sketch of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus who appears, so casually, to discomfit the Incredulous with wondrously wrought conversions. The pamphlet closes with an excursus on the Credulous, prior to which St. Scholastica's pious prank on her brother Benedict is recounted with due naivety. There is much more than naivety in Father Holland's writing; there is the open-eyed discernment of faith. There was discernment too in his choice of Mr. LeRoy H. Appleton as an illustrator of this slender masterpiece.

#### APOLOGETICAL

**Papist Pie**, published by Father Clement Tigar, S.J., of Campion House, Osterley, at the modest price of half-a-crown, is a real "dish to set before a king." It contains 130 pages of the Questions and Answers that have appeared in *Stella Maris* during the war. Then *Stella Maris* went into war dress to provide for the Catholic men and women, serving with the Forces, and it dealt, in a brisk and straightforward manner, with their religious queries. Courageously, this collection starts with the heading "Nuns," sufficient to frighten off the merely flippant. Other headings follow: "Marriage and Divorce," "Relations of the Sexes," "The Pope," "Heaven, Hell and Purgatory," "R.C. Church," "The Bible," to mention only some of them. The answers to questions are short, snappy and direct, and occasionally very humorous; there are some delicious marginal drawings, and an index to help you track down the various subjects. I dislike the expression "Religion Made Easy" but it certainly could be applied to this particular book, into which is squeezed a surprising amount of Catholic doctrine; and it appears in a Penguin format and so can be carried easily in a side pocket. If you have any argumentative non-Catholic friends—their number is legion—this is just the right thing for them.

---

#### EDITORIAL NOTE

All contributions submitted to the Editor must be typed and be accompanied by a sufficiently large stamped addressed envelope—stamps (or Post Office coupons from abroad) alone will not suffice. Articles so submitted should be concerned with matters of general interest, and be the fruit of expert knowledge or original research. They should not ordinarily exceed 3,000 words, and must be intended for exclusive publication in the "Month," if accepted.

Literary Communications, Exchanges, and Books for Review should be addressed to The Editor of "The Month," 114 Mount Street, London, W.1, and not to the Publishers: Business Communications to The Manager, Manresa Press, Roehampton, London, S.W.15.

Printed in Great Britain at the BURLEIGH PRESS, Lewin's Mead, BRISTOL

## "THE UNIVERSE"

The Leading Catholic Newspaper  
merits your support.

It has faithfully and zealously served the Catholic Cause at home and abroad during the whole period of its long history 1860-1945. Its able editorials, Notes and Comments, powerful articles and unrivalled news service place it in the front rank of newspapers.

**EVERY FRIDAY 2d**

Direct Subscriptions: 13s. Inland, or Abroad  
per year.. Inclusive of postage.

Special terms for members of His Majesty's  
Forces: 10s. per year, inclusive of postage, and  
*pro rata* for 6 or 3 months.

*Head Office:*

Field House, Breams Buildings, London,  
E.C.4.

*Eighty-first thousand*

## The Difficult Commandment

By REV. C. C. MARTINDALE, S.J.

"Of the many books that deal with the delicate matter of sex, whether they be hygienic, psychological, or frankly Freudian, not all are entirely satisfactory. Even the professedly religious—or should we say pious?—way of dealing with the difficulties involved is not always helpful to those who most need help. This is the sanest and most wholesome book we have seen on this subject."  
*Blockfriers.*

**Price Ninepence Net.**

## MANUAL OF PRAYERS FOR YOUTH

(SIXTIETH THOUSAND)

With the approbation of the  
Archbishop of Westminster and  
of the Archbishop-Bishop of  
Southwark.

This excellent prayer book, an especial favourite in Catholic Colleges and Convent Schools, was entirely re-arranged by the late Father Joseph Keating, S.J., in consultation with various spiritual Authorities. The manual has been described as truly manly and practical, and appeals to all whose piety is sincere, simple and devout.

**Price, 3/6 net cloth boards.**

LONDON:

MANRESA PRESS, ROEHAMPTON, S.W.15

## SWORD OF THE SPIRIT

*President:*

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL GRIFFIN  
*Archbishop of Westminster.*

The **Sword of the Spirit** was established  
by Cardinal Hinsley in August, 1940:

To unite Catholics in an understanding of  
the spiritual issues arising from the war;

To emphasize the need for Christian  
principles in social and international  
reconstruction;

To call upon Catholics for more sincere  
**Prayer**, for more serious **Study** of the  
Church's teaching on social and public  
questions, for more energetic **Action**.

The **Sword of the Spirit** Bulletin is published  
every month. Price 4d.

*Headquarters:—*

24 Dorset Square, LONDON, N.W.1.

## HAVE YOU EVER THOUGHT...

that a subscription from you to the  
C.T.S. may be the means of bringing  
the Faith to others? The demand  
for pamphlets is greater than ever,  
but their production is made possible  
only by members.

Write TODAY for details:

## CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY

38-40 ECCLESTON SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.1

## THE MONTH

(Double-Number. Two Shillings net)

EDITOR REV. JOHN MURRAY, S.J.

THE MONTH was founded in July, 1864, to represent  
the point of view and the claims of the Catholic Faith,  
and it has continued to do so for more than eighty one  
years. The need to fight the battles of the Church in  
English-speaking lands—a cause to which the periodica  
is wholly consecrated—was never greater, and the Editor  
ventures to hope that the support given to his efforts may  
always continue and be extended.

PUBLISHERS Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd.  
London.

Annual subscription 13s. post free (U.S.A. \$3.25), should  
be sent to the Manager, Manresa Press, Roehampton  
London, S.W.15.

**— NOW READY —**

## **John Henry Newman**

By **JOHN MOODY**

**15/- net**

Here is a new account of the life and writings of the great Cardinal. For length and treatment it is just what is needed by the general reader without the leisure to read the great two-volume biography of Wilfrid Ward.

## **Apologia Pro Vita Sua**

By **CARDINAL NEWMAN**

**7/6 net**

With an Introduction by **MAISIE WARD**

Few of the great books of the world have had so casual an origin as this. The Rev. Charles Kingsley had accused Newman of teaching that lying was no harm. Newman decided to set the refutation of this particular accusation in a larger framework, and thus the *Apologia* came to be written.

*Please order from your Bookseller*

**SHEED & WARD LTD.**

**110/111 Fleet Street, E.C.4**

## **ENJOYING THE NEW TESTAMENT**

By **Margaret T. Monro**

*With a Foreword by the Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J.*

This book aims to help Catholics who, though familiar with the New Testament in selections, would like to make its acquaintance as a whole. A reading course has therefore been devised with this end in view. In order to simplify the more tedious elements of 'background,' the books are studied for the most part in the order in which they were written, with just enough of introduction to make clear why and to whom they were written.

With Map

**8/6 net**

**LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.**